School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1394401

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY OF
RICHARD OUDERSLUYS

Lauchlan Clarke

NEW TESTAMENT PROBLEMS

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

ST. BASIL THE GREAT

A Study in Monasticism.
Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.

THE LAUSIAC HISTORY OF PALLADIUS

English Translation with Notes.
S.P.C.K. 5s.

THE ASCETIC WORKS OF ST. BASIL

English Translation with Notes.
S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

361
385

NEW TESTAMENT PROBLEMS

ESSAYS—REVIEWS—INTERPRETATIONS

BY

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE, D.D.

LIBRARY OF
RICHARD OUDERSLUYS

NEW YORK
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
Printed in Great Britain
1929

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

First published 1929

DEDICATORY EPISTLE

To the Rev. F. J. Foakes-Jackson, D.D.,

Union Theological Seminary, New York, Fellow and formerly Dean of Jesus College, Cambridge.

In 1899 *I went up to Jesus College, Cambridge, where for the first time I learned to study, my schooldays having been rather lazy. At the beginning of the term I had an interview with Dr. Morgan, the Master, who assured me that scholars always worked eight hours a day. In my simplicity, my Urdummheit, I believed his words, and henceforward studied eight hours a day, holidays included. A day or two after this interview I had the first of many impulses to endeavour that I was to receive from you. You preached a sermon on the abnormally small entry of freshmen, only twenty in number, taking as your text* 1 *Samuel xiv.* 6: "*There is no restraint to the Lord, to save by many or by few.*" *You said the outlook was dark, but not hopeless if every freshman present would resolve to do his best in work and sport alike. One hearer at least resolved to lead the strenuous life in future.*

In 1902 *I began to study Theology and came under your direct influence. You did very little in the way of formal lecturing, expecting me to do all ordinary things, such as Hebrew grammar, for myself. But one thing you did to perfection. In a very busy life you found time to ask me to your rooms constantly. There you talked incessantly to me on every kind of Biblical and theological problem. You even revived the glories of the Peripatetic School, discoursing as you walked up and down the room and dressed for dinner. You inspired me with a conviction that Theology was the one supremely interesting subject, to attain proficiency in which no toil was too great.*

When I went down from the University your interest in me continued. Through your influence I received my first commissions from publishers. You invited me to contribute to a volume of theological essays, I fear years before I was mature enough to do so. You would absurdly over-praise my first attempts to write, and then, just when I was tempted to be complacent, fiercely denounce my "facile second-hand touches." You see I remember it all, though you will have long ago forgotten. You brought me up to Cambridge to be a member of the Seminar out of which your great work "The Beginnings of Christianity" ultimately grew. You even invited me to be present when you and Professor Lake discussed the plan for that enterprise.

Having done all this, I fancy you prevented me from writing the theological books I had planned. For when I went to be Editorial Secretary of the S.P.C.K. in 1915 *and henceforward had to spend my life in revising other men's books, I think it must have been your letter to the Committee, in which you said "Clarke is much more orthodox than he thinks he is," that turned the scale in my favour.*

Then I reflect that I am only one of hundreds of your pupils in England and America on whom you have lavished affection and interest, and I begin to realise what the compensations of a teacher's life must be. He is enshrined in so many hearts, and, if sometimes we forget, in later years early memories revive. We, your pupils, ought to have combined to offer you a volume of Essays as a Festgabe on your seventieth birthday. Failing that, let one of them offer a modest tribute. I wish it had been more original and so more in keeping with the man to whom it is dedicated. But each man must make his own contribution to scholarship, which will be dictated by the conditions of his life. For many years now I have read more than 1,000 *books a year, printed and in manuscript. This leaves me no time for sustained effort. But it does teach me the knack of tearing the heart out of a book in a short time. So in the following pages you will find a good many summaries of recent books. Probably you already know*

them, but to others the theories discussed may be new. If a scholarly-minded clergyman, who has "no time to read," as a result of my book feels that he knows just as much about a number of recent theories as he wants to know, I shall be satisfied. If he is led to wonder at the fertility of the German mind in framing hypotheses and, even though he disagrees with them, to respect our former enemies more, I shall be more than satisfied.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

Essays 1-4, 6-8, 11, 13, 14, 18-22 have appeared in *Theology*; Essay 9 in *The Church Quarterly Review*; Essay 16 in *The Expository Times*; Essay 23 in *The Review of the Churches*. Some of these have been revised. Thanks are due to the authorities of these periodicals for permission to reprint.

PREFACE

By the Rev. A. Nairne, D.D.,

Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

FROM his editorial chair Dr. Lowther Clarke surveys the contemporary movements of mankind. He observes with kindly interest the zeal of parties and the pragmatic interplay. But his occupation is the realm of thought, and month by month he holds out a guiding hand to wanderers in that realm. He reads the new books, by hundreds. And he writes brief notes, not bookishly, about them; indicating their significance, their relation to one another and to old ideas and fresh developments, their bearing upon faith and practice, the gist which matters to a man who fears God. One might guess that he talks about them with companions; certainly he broods upon them; sometimes of nights he dreams of them.

In this volume a decent number of these lucubrations are collected. The selection is carefully arranged, and those who use it will find orientation in the maze of modern views. Dr. Lowther Clarke presents these views one after another, shows how they lie scattered yet combining like constellations in the firmament. He puts his readers better than up to date; he orientates them. And he has all the while one comprehensive *theoria* himself. He is illuminated by the ancient catholic creed, and therefore can expatiate; sometimes somewhat fancifully, on his own; sometimes cautiously but never timidly: it is never worth his while to be conventional, but sometimes he pulls up with a judicial No.

That does not often happen. He entertains a scholarly *humanitas*, and no small part of the charm of these notes is the sympathy with which he sets out other persons' ideas and arguments. He puts his hero's or his victim's case concisely but completely, with more than fairness, with persuasion.

Yet he is critical. Objections and counter-arguments follow the exposition. And these are shrewd enough; though not exhaustive. For Dr. Lowther Clarke seems determined to be readable. He has anthologized from his journal. He has not designed a substantial treatise. These are Essays, not an *Instauratio Maxima*. He abbreviates the folios of others. He culls what flowers he chooses from his own meditations. And who has a better right than himself to select from himself? And who will be better pleased than himself if a learned reader thinks he could pack the case with additional instances?

Some of the briefer notes are the most acute and least fit for lazy reading. But common sense insists that the book will chiefly live by certain longer and elaborated exercises, such as "The 'Formgeschichtlich' Method" "Eduard Meyer on the Origins of Christianity" and (best of all) "Confession to Laymen" with its matured sketch of St. Basil.

But this preface is running into a review; almost pardonably when so enjoyable a book, so full of news, is being introduced. But it is a preface, written in grateful response to a good friend's invitation, a good scholar's generosity. His book needs no preface from such a pen as mine. But the scholar offered me an honour, and the friend bade me read the dedication after which my preface would stand. That dedication is too witty and affectionate, too appropriate, for me to spoil by superfluity. I am one of so many who owe a world of love to Dr. Foakes Jackson, and (no doubt like each unit of the multitude) I feel as if no one can owe quite as much as I do.

I think Dr. Foakes Jackson will like this book. It has an affinity. Dr. Foakes Jackson has often said that he was no scholar but could drive a team. The disclaimer is like Saul the son of Kish belittling his pedigree; a pretty bit of modesty where rank is unquestioned. The great volumes on Acts display his power to drive a spirited team with spirit. And in this book of Dr. Lowther Clarke's we also admire an editor driving a team. He brings his cattle from all the quarters of the learned world, and makes them run in harness to a goal. He manages them by understanding them, and only now and then needs

to crack the whip. The pace exhilarates. This is criticism in open air. From Dr. Foakes Jackson he has learned that learning must be alive. And he and all disciples of our dear master think of something more than that; of long talks, intimate confessions, paradox and sudden depths:—Ah! those uncommon privileges of the fortunate.

I muse of all this, and then of that veiled charioteer of Hellas:

"There was something of his old miraculous kindred, alien from this busy new world he came to, about the boyish driver with the fame of a scholar, in his grey fleecy cloak and hood, as he drove in that morning. . . .

"Later legend breaks a supernatural light over the fancy . . . no more of a solace than if he flourished still, a little deity, but under a new name and veiled now in old age, in the haunted grove of Aricia, far from his old Attic home, in a land which had never seen him as he was."

A. N.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
DEDICATORY EPISTLE	v
PREFACE BY A. NAIRNE, D.D.	ix
I. THE VIRGIN BIRTH AND RECENT DISCUSSION	1
II. THE "FORMGESCHICHTLICH" METHOD	18
III. THREE MARKAN TEXTS:	
(*a*) vi. 3	31
(*b*) ix. 4	34
(*c*) x. 13-16	36
IV. "A PROPHET LIKE UNTO ME"	39
V. JESUS AND THE PHARISEES	48
VI. THE "EXCEPTING CLAUSE" IN ST. MATTHEW, WITH A NOTE BY F. GAVIN	59
VII. A NOTE ON THE PROTO-LUKE HYPOTHESIS	66
VIII. THE OVERSHADOWING OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY	71
IX. CHRISTIAN AND GREEK MIRACLE STORIES	76
X. THE MARRIAGE FEAST AT CANA	86
XI. TWO JOHANNINE TEXTS:	
(*a*) xiv. 1-4	96
(*b*) xxi. 15-17	100
XII. WHAT BECAME OF OUR LORD'S BODY?	102
XIII. THE ECONOMIC BACKGROUND OF THE BIBLE	108
XIV. EDUARD MEYER ON THE ORIGINS OF CHRISTIANITY	118
XV. ST. PAUL'S CONVERSION AND THE BEGINNINGS OF GENTILE CHRISTIANITY	132
XVI. WAS ST. PAUL A STAMMERER?	136
XVII. THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS	141
XVIII. TWO PAULINE TEXTS:	
(*a*) 1 Corinthians xiii. 13	151
(*b*) Galatians iii. 20	153
XIX. "DIE HAUSTAFELN"	157
XX. THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE EUCHARIST	161
XXI. CONFESSION TO LAYMEN	185
XXII. THE MANDAEANS	206
XXIII. MAY WE EXPECT A RELIGIOUS REVIVAL?	212
INDEX OF NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES	218
GENERAL INDEX	221

NEW TESTAMENT PROBLEMS

I

THE VIRGIN BIRTH AND RECENT DISCUSSION

THE publication of four important books during the years 1920-1924 may be held to justify another discussion of a familiar subject. Dr. Vincent Taylor's *The Virgin Birth* (Oxford, 1920) is the most thorough investigation in English from the standpoint of literary criticism. H. Leisegang's *Pneuma Hagion* (Leipzig, 1922) seeks a solution of the problem along the lines of Hellenistic mysticism, asking what conception " by the Holy Spirit " would have meant to the Greek readers of the Third Gospel. Eduard Norden, the brilliant classical scholar, in his *Die Geburt des Kindes* (Leipzig, 1924), with the help of Holl's work on Epiphanius works a vein of research which yields unexpected treasures. Then R. Kittel, the Leipzig Professor, whose name carries much weight in England, published in 1924 a fascinating study called *Die hellenistische Mysterien-religionen und das Alte Testament* (Stuttgart, 1924), in which he carried the investigation a stage further. In the following discussion I shall make more use of his book than of Norden's, though he confesses that it would never have been written if Holl and Norden had not pointed the way.

I

Let us begin with Christmas and Epiphany,[1] and the account of their origin given in a source of unimpeachable orthodoxy, Duchesne's *Christian Worship*.[2] Christmas was a Western feast, first attested in the Philocalian Calendar of 336 A.D. The Easterns by the fourth century had come to observe Jan. 6 as

[1] Usener's *Das Weihnachtfest* has been the classic storehouse of facts until lately.

[2] Pp. 257-265.

the date of the Nativity.[1] The derivation of Dec. 25 from the Saturnalia is impossible, for this feast, beginning on Dec. 17, was never prolonged beyond the 23rd. A connection with the birthday of *Sol Invictus* or of Mithras is more plausible. Duchesne's own theory is as follows.

Hippolytus assigns the Crucifixion to March 25, a date arbitrarily chosen or suggested by the spring equinox. Christ was thought to have lived an even number of years, therefore His Incarnation (or Conception) also took place on March 25, and His Birth on Dec. 25. Sozomen mentions a sect of Montanists who celebrated the Passover on April 6, that is the full moon which followed the new moon of March 24; nine months from this date brings us to Jan. 6.[2] "I would not venture to say in regard to the 25th of December, that the coincidence of the *Sol novus* exercised no direct or indirect influence on the ecclesiastical decisions arrived at in regard to the matter." Thus Duchesne; let us now look at the heathen feasts observed on the two days.[3]

The starting point of the discussion is a passage in Epiphanius,[4] who states that Christ was born eight days before the Ides of January, thirteen days after the winter solstice.

> This day the Greeks, I mean the idolaters, keep as a feast —December 25, the day called by the Romans Saturnalia, by the Egyptians Kronia, by the Alexandrians Kikellia. For eight days before January 1 comes this division of time, or solstice, and the day begins to lengthen as the light increases, and thirteen days pass until we reach January 6, a thirtieth part of an hour being added each day up to the day of Christ's Nativity. So also the wise Syrian writer Ephraim testifies in his Expositions . . . [the heathen observance of the feast].

[1] Clem. Al., *Strom.* i. 21, is the earliest reference: "The followers of Basilides hold the day of His baptism as a festival, spending the night before in readings."

[2] Soz. *H.E.* vii. 18. The passage when studied seems insufficient to bear much weight, and is far less striking than those to be adduced presently.

[3] The rest of this section is based on Kittel, pp. 17-48, and Norden, *passim*.

[4] *Panarion*, li. 22. See Holl's edition (1922) in the Berlin Fathers, with brief notes summarizing his fuller discussion, "Der Ursprung des Epiphanienfestes," in the *Sitzungber. Berl. Akad.* (1917), pp. 402 *ff*.

> First let us consider the so-called Koreion in Alexandria. This is a great temple, the sacred enclosure of Kore. The whole night through they keep watch, singing to the idol with hymns to a flute accompaniment. Having finished their vigil, when the cocks have crowed, they descend with torches in their hands to an underground chapel and take up a naked image of carved wood. This they set on a litter. On its brow it has a golden seal in the shape of a cross, and on its two hands similar seals, as also on both knees, five seals in all worked in gold. They carry this wooden image seven times in procession round the inner temple, with flutes and drums and hymns,[1] and then bring it back to the underground place in a Bacchic rout. If you ask them the meaning of this mystery they reply: "At this hour to-day Kore (that is the Virgin) bore Æon." [The same takes place in Petra and Eleusis.]

The important datum about December 25 is that the Alexandrians called it Kikellia. The word occurs in the Decree of Canopus (239/8 B.C.),[2] so the feast can apparently be traced back at least to that year. Its character is known only from evidence of the imperial time, but it is highly probable that it was celebrated in similar fashion at an early period. In an Egyptian calendar *circa* 200 A.D. there is a note: "Birthday of the Sun. Light increases." Macrobius[3] says that the Egyptians brought a little boy (*parvulus*) out of an *adytum* on the shortest day, to represent the infant sun. A scholion to Gregory Nazianzen states that on December 25 the Greeks have a feast on which (presumably at sunrise) they cry, as they come out of the temple: "The Virgin has brought forth, Light increases." Since Epiphanius brings together the Alexandrian and the Eleusinian mysteries we are justified in adducing the well-known passage from Hippolytus: "The hierophant . . . celebrating by night at Eleusis the great and ineffable mysteries beside a huge fire, cries aloud and makes proclamation, saying: A holy child has the Lady brought forth, Brimo Brimo, that is, the Strong (has given birth to) the Strong."[4]

[1] *Cf.* the rededication of the Temple "with songs and harps and lutes, and with cymbals," 1 Macc. iv. 54.
[2] Dittenberger, *Orientis Græci Inscr.*, i. 108.
[3] 5th cent., *Sat.* i. 18.
[4] *Phil.* v. 8.

Evidence from Syria[1] and Arabia points to a sun-god festival in those lands on Dec. 25. His mother is the *Magna Mater*; she is also regarded as a virgin, and in Babylonia is identified with the constellation Virgo. By the imperial time astral associations had disappeared from the popular mind. The main idea was that of a divine child, mysteriously born and representing the birth of a new age. We cannot safely trace it further back than the Decree of Canopus.

The festival of January 5/6 is parallel to that described above; it was in honour of the god Æon. The Alexander-romance, dating from the Ptolemaic period, says that Alexander founded the city, which was protected by Æon Ploutonios (" of the under-world "). The ceremony described by Epiphanius apparently means that, as the image is taken from the underground chamber, so Æon is born from his mother's womb. The five seals represent the five quarters of Alexandria; like the marks on a slave or sheep, they indicate possession—the tutelary god of the city is an under-world god, servant of the supreme god. Æon was originally abstract, standing for the permanence of time as opposed to its mutations shown in the stars and seasons, but it came to be paralleled with the sun-god, and in Egypt equated with Horus.[2]

But why these two parallel feasts so near together? Norden, following up the researches of Sethe, the Egyptologist, gives a brilliant answer. In 1996 B.C.[3] Amen-em-het I. of Thebes, setting up the middle Kingdom, introduced a reformed calendar. At this time the winter-solstice fell on January 6 of the Julian Calendar. The real time went back about a day in 128 years, so that by the fourth century B.C. the winter-

[1] In 274 Aurelian instituted a temple to Sol Invictus, and ordered a feast in his honour on Dec. 25 every four years. The god is a Syrian sun-god, whom Aurelian, following Heliogabalus, made the god of the Roman Empire.

[2] A Syrian baal is attested as *Mārā 'almā*, " lord of eternity." See below for parallels in the O.T. The birthdays of Dionysos and Osiris were also observed on January 5-6. Reitzenstein, criticizing Norden, says that Iranian influences have been too much neglected by him.

[3] So Breasted and the German School. *The Cambridge Ancient History*, i. 173, gives *c.* 2212 for this monarch. It is worth noting that the earliest example of Egyptian " prophecy " refers to this monarch; see König in *Theology*, July 1924, for a criticism of such " prophecies."

solstice actually fell on December 24/25. This gives us the two dates. It is tempting to suppose that a Hellenistic sun-god festival on December 25 was introduced by the side of the original national celebration (birthday of Osiris, afterwards Æon) on January 6, soon after the founding of Alexandria.

If this feast of the winter-solstice was observed in Syria, Arabia and Egypt, it is reasonable to expect some traces of it in the Old Testament. Since Ewald scholars have found such traces in the Maccabæan festival of the *Chanukkah*, or Dedication. On the 25th of Chislev (our December) 168 B.C. the Temple was defiled by Antiochus's orders.[1] On the same day three years later it was re-consecrated.[2] In view of the wide observance of a winter-solstice festival, and the tenacity with which religious traditions are maintained, it is reasonable to suppose that the Syrians deliberately chose December 25, and that the Jews provided a substitute for the Hellenistic observance. The month Chislev is only approximately our December, since the Jewish months are on a lunar basis, but the eight days[3] of the feast would always include the actual solstice.[4]

II

Scholars generally are agreed that among the Jews " there was no expectation, so far as we can judge, of a Virgin Birth, and it was, so far as we can judge, inconsistent with ordinary Jewish expectations and beliefs."[5] Kittel's treatment of certain Old Testament passages, now to be described, must therefore appear bold.

Isaiah vii. 10-16 (" Behold a virgin shall conceive," etc.), ix. 1-7 (" Unto us a child is born," etc.), and xi. 1-10 (" the root of Jesse " passage) describe the coming of a new age, Æon,

[1] 1 Macc. i. 54, 59; " the fifteenth " of 54 is generally taken to be a slip.

[2] 1 Macc. iv. 52 *ff.*

[3] 1 Macc. iv. 56.

[4] So Kittel declares. Dr. Oesterley tells me that the problem is exceptionally complicated; materials for a decision may be found in Mahler, *Chronologische Vergleichung-Tabelle* (1889), and Schwartz, *Der jüdische Kalendar historisch und astronomisch untersucht* (1872).

[5] A. C. Headlam, *Miracles in the N.T.*, p. 292. *Cf.* Box, *The Virgin Birth of Jesus*, p. 169, where the LXX version of Isa. vii. 14 is said to be the only piece of evidence.

lasting till the end of things (ix. 7), bringing peace and justice. The harmony of the animal world shows how miraculous it is. So in eighth-century Israel we have a belief in a saviour-child who will grow up and accomplish his work. "Thy land, O Immanuel," of viii. 8 shows that he is thought of as lord of Judah. Isaiah in vii. 14 ("shall conceive and bear a son") is alluding to the stories, already familiar in Jerusalem, of Ishmael[1] and Samson.[2] In ix. and xi. the saviour's warfare is over, in vii. it is still in front of him. "Butter (or milk) and honey" are the food of the gods.[3] So this is a *Wunderkind*. His mother is an *'almāh*, a young woman ripe for marriage, either virgin or married.

Isaiah seems to have used an old myth, perhaps akin to that of Horus, who becomes Osiris and is elevated to the throne. Horus—Osiris—Immanuel—Helios—Æon are members of a series of allied figures which we can trace through the centuries. The "strong lady" of the Eleusinian mysteries who brought forth the "strong son" recalls the lady of Isa. vii. 14 who brought forth the *El-gibbor* (God-mighty one, "Mighty God") of ix. 6. There was no deliberate borrowing. Isaiah thought of a definite man who would come as saviour, born and growing up wonderfully. No other literary form existed except the well-known one, long familiar on Palestinian soil.[4] *Ha-'almāh*, "*the* (well-known divine) woman,"[5] is significant. She is known to the readers, just as the term "God" as applied to

[1] Gen. xvi. 11: "Thou art with child and shalt bear a son." The Ishmael story is evidently a tribal story of the ancestor of the Bedouin; it is told at a well, and *Lahai-roi* is the god who *looks* favourably on his worshippers.

[2] Judg. xiii. 3: "Thou shalt conceive, and bear a son"—a future saviour.

[3] Many examples are given.

[4] The possibility of this cannot be denied. "Faded myths," e.g. those of Leviathan and Rahab, are commonplaces of O.T. criticism. Isa. i. 29, xvii. 10 are evidence of a Palestinian Adonis-cult in the prophet's time. *The Cambridge Ancient History* shows conclusively how strong Egyptian influence was in Palestine during the second millennium, and that the Conquest made no violent break in Palestinian culture.

[5] Usually explained by the well-known Hebrew idiom which uses the definite where we use the indefinite article. The noun, which becomes definite in the course of the passage, is treated as such from the outset.

the king in the Psalms is familiar; in neither case do the writers commit themselves to the full implication of the words. But how did the "young woman" become a "virgin"? For this we must go to Babylonia, where Ishtar, the original of the *Magna Mater*, is described as a virgin in early times and is connected with the constellation Virgo. The Jews during the Exile must have known of this. Anyhow, by the time the Alexandrian translation of the prophets was made, the meaning was so clearly understood that *'almāh* in Isa. vii. 14 becomes ἡ παρθενος.[1]

There are faint traces in the Old Testament of the Æon-conception, an original for which in Egypt or Babylon is hard to find. In Gen. xxi. 33 (J., 9th cent.) Yahweh is addressed as *El 'Olam*, God of Eternity, of the dim times of old, and lasting for ever—evidently a local god of the Canaanites amalgamated with Yahweh-religion. In Isa. ix. 6 Immanuel is "Father of Eternity." The prophetic expressions "in that day," "at the end of the days," point to a new æon. Whereas the Alexandrians made Æon an under-world god, the Jews took the conception into their monotheism as a characteristic of God.[2]

Certain ideas, Kittel thinks, cognate to those of the mysteries existed in Israel before there was any contact with Hellenistic religion. He lays considerable stress on the Accession of Yahweh Feast which recent investigators[3] have deduced from the Psalms (*cf.* xlvii., xciii., xcv.-xcix.). Just as the Accession-feast of Osiris was also that of the king, who was identified with Osiris, and in Babylonia Marduk's procession was a New Year's feast, so we must presume a dramatic representation, like that of Adonis or Marduk, taken from the Canaanites, in which the king represented Yahweh, but which rapidly became spiritualized. Probably it was a New Year's (autumn) feast,

[1] Elsewhere the translators clearly understand the difference between *bethūlah*, an unmarried woman, and *'almāh*, so the rendering here must be deliberate.

[2] Kittel has an illuminating discussion of the use of αἰών in the LXX, in the light of the Alexandrian conceptions of Æon which he has previously established. He is inclined to think that the Jews of Alexandria borrowed very little from surrounding paganism but rather influenced it.

[3] Mowinckel; see Gunkel, *Einleitung in die Psalmen*, pp. 93 *ff*.

as in Babylonia, the king being set on his throne each year. In so far as the people identified themselves with the king, who represented Yahweh, there was a mystery-feeling in Israel. But, just as the prophet remained an active participant and did not sink into the Godhead, so it was with the Jewish μύστης. God came into him, and in an ethical rather than physical sense. And there was no *Jenseits* conception, of the kind found in Hellenistic circles, among the Jews. The idea of immortality came from the sense of union with God.

The reader will probably doubt whether Kittel has added anything of definite importance to the one fact already clear, namely that the Alexandrian translators rendered *'almāh* by πάρθενος, which is significant, but not strong enough to bear much weight. But undoubtedly he has shown us vistas of surprising interest, and the thoughts suggested by this part of his book so clearly fall into line with other conclusions of contemporary Old Testament research that we shall do well to keep an open mind.

III

Much of Kittel's ground is also covered by Norden's book on *The Birth of the Child*, but, whereas Kittel approaches the subject from the Old Testament side, Norden begins and ends with Virgil's Fourth Eclogue. To understand the originality of his book, we must first sketch the current explanation as given by R. S. Conway, W. Warde Fowler and J. B. Mayor in *Virgil's Messianic Eclogue* (1907).

The civil wars of a century were culminating in the struggle between Octavian and Antony. In September of the year 40 B.C. the Peace of Brundisium gave the world a respite. The poem is addressed to Pollio, consul for 40, in whose consulship is expected the birth of a child who will inaugurate the reign of peace and justice. The father must be Octavian; the son, expected towards the end of 40, was never born, for in 39 Scribonia bore a *daughter* to Octavian. The *Eclogue* was already published, and Virgil did not draw attention to the disappointment by withdrawing the poem. The beautiful final lines, in which the child's smile is mentioned, must refer to an actual child. They can be paraphrased thus: " Begin, little one, for

babes who do not thus own their mother's love cannot expect the favour of her guardian deities."[1] Virgil is working on an oracle imported from the East, probably by the Roman armies which had been in Syria and Egypt, going back ultimately to Isaiah.

Norden considers this interpretation radically wrong, though he agrees that the (Christian) Messianic interpretation is in the main right. The poem is intended to glorify Pollio's consulate; like similar poems, it must be placed at the beginning of the year referred to. The autumn of 40 is unsuitable. Peace is still in the future. *Perpetua formido* (l. 14) prevails at the time of writing. All similar descriptions look forward from a time of suffering to one of peace. The details suit no earthly child. Virgil writes at the turn of the year 41/40, when war had broken out again. The Saturnalia are just over[2] (l. 6 *redeunt Saturnia regna*); the sun-god enters upon his reign at the winter-solstice (l. 10 *iam regnat Apollo*). Lucina of l. 10 is his sister[3] the Virgo, the " Eleithyia carrying in her arms a child " of Greek astrology. The sun-god's birthday precedes that of the child. The *ultima ætas* of l. 4 is the Æon, a conception which we have discussed above, celebrated on January 5/6.

No earthly child is in the poet's mind; rather, in a time of terrible strain, he uses the widespread " Messianic " ideas and predicts a *Wunderkind*, a divine child marvellously born who will restore the Golden Age and inaugurate a new æon of peace, mercy and justice.

IV

In Dr. Taylor's book we tread the familiar ground of literary criticism of the New Testament. Within its limits the book could hardly be better; the arguments are familiar, but wonderfully thorough and lucid.

Outside the First and Third Gospels, a candid examination finds no trace of the Virgin Birth. It was evidently not part

[1] (W. Warde Fowler) p. 78. The *deus* and *dea* are Hercules and Juno, the *dii conjugales*.

[2] This point, not in Norden, seems worth making. The actual Saturnalia may have suggested the fabled *Saturnia regna*.

[3] *Tuus . . . Apollo*.

of the Apostolic preaching and the Pauline Christology was built up without it. St. John must have known the story; he does not deny it, " but his own Christology has superior spiritual attractions " for him. Certain passages in St. Luke seem inconsistent with it. Thus, iii. 22, if the Western reading is adopted; iii. 23 " as was supposed "; and others. The crucial verses i. 34, 35 are a later insertion inconsistent with the rest of the story of the Annunciation.[1] Therefore, when Luke wrote chapters i. and ii., he had no knowledge of the Virgin Birth. But—and this is Dr. Taylor's special contribution to the debate —the language of the two verses is thoroughly Lukan, and no suspicion of textual confusion appears. The inference is that Luke added them himself in a final revision of his work. At an earlier period, having traced all things accurately from the first, he knew nothing of the tradition. Later it came to him from some unknown source which he evidently valued highly. He inserted the crucial verses, but without making consequential alterations elsewhere in his Gospel, except for the one " as was supposed " of iii. 23.

Matthew i. and ii. show the story at a later stage, which may, however, be contemporaneous with Luke; objections are presupposed, and answered by implication. The doctrine of the Virgin Birth must have had a private vogue before it became public property. We know nothing of its origin, but Isa. vii. 14 is all-important. What must it have meant to Jews who had come under the spell of Jesus ! Dr. Taylor's conclusion is " not proven "; " all that we can reach is a primitive belief, generally accepted within New Testament times, which presumably implies an earlier private tradition."[2]

The theory that Luke revised his own work is probable, even certain, in the light of the fuller account of the Ascension which he gives in the Acts. But the interpolation theory is shipwrecked on one obstinate fact—the parallelism of the Annunciations to Zacharias and Mary. Verse 33=17, 34=18, 35=19, and 36=20. If Luke interpolated 34, 35 on learning this secret tradition, he must have interpolated 18, 19 at the

[1] The reasons for holding this view will be found in all recent full-length Commentaries.

[2] P. 128.

same time to complete the parallelism, although he forgot to remove the traces of his earlier belief that Joseph was the human father of Jesus from these two chapters—surely a *reductio ad absurdum* ![1]

V

Leisegang's *Pneuma Hagion* is on quite different lines from the foregoing books. His purpose is to ascertain what the Greek Gospels meant to the first readers, to whom the ideas of Hellenistic mysticism were familiar. There are two fallacies here, if the object is not to write a thesis but to reach the truth. It is clearly wrong to explain early Christian conceptions by Greek parallels, when more obvious origins exist in the Old Testament, already presented in a Greek dress by the Septuagint. And, if such interpretations of the Virgin Birth narratives did occur to readers, the natural conclusion is that they were wrong; the common sense of the Church rejected them, and they left no trace in early patristic exegesis.[2]

The special conception of Spirit found in the Synoptic Gospels belongs not to the original Palestinian stratum, but to a later stage of contact with heathenism. " Pneuma Hagion " is a holy spirit which plays a rôle in the life of Jesus, announcing His coming, operating at His conception, coming down on Him at baptism, explained by Jesus to the world, and finally passing over to the disciples. Except for some isolated *logia*, which are elaborately discussed in the latter part of Leisegang's book, the Spirit recedes from sight in the Synoptists after the Baptism. Jesus does *not* baptize with the Spirit, as John is said to have foretold; the actual disciples of John had not even heard of the Holy Spirit (Acts xix. 2). The Greek Gospels read back into the life of Jesus the conditions of their day, when *glossolalia* (spiritual utterances akin to those of the Pythia at Delphi) was common, being regarded with reverence as evidence of the divine working. In the Fourth Gospel, which is most closely linked with Hellenistic piety, Spirit pervades the whole.

As regards the Birth-stories, there is no real literary parallel

[1] See W. Lockton, *The Resurrection and the Virgin Birth*, p. 129.

[2] This is now available to the English reader in Dr. Harold Smith's *Ante-Nicene Exegesis of the Gospels*.

to the "with child of the Holy Ghost" (ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου) of Matt. i. 18. We must use popular Semitic ideas to illustrate it, as we use popular papyri to illustrate the grammar and vocabulary of the New Testament. In Syria to-day, a spirit (*Weli* or *Jinn*) is thought to be the father of certain children. No one, either now or in New Testament times, would have said "God" was the father, but physical paternity may be predicated of a god, or higher spirit. This is the best we can do to explain Matthew's story from Semitic sources, if the Greek influences seen in Luke are to be excluded.

In the Third Gospel we are in an atmosphere of Hellenistic mysticism. The characters in chapters i. and ii. receive the Spirit and prophesy,[1] like the Pythia. In Mary's case a virgin conceives when she receives the Spirit. True, we cannot prove that the Pythia had a child as a result of her experience, but the word ἐγγαστρίμυθος shows that the Spirit was supposed to have entered the lower organs, in which, according to primitive belief, the soul resided; and the sitting over a tripod was significant.[2]

VI

At this point it may be well to pause in order to define the various senses in which the phrases Divine or Virgin Births may be used. That such definition is desirable is suggested by some words of Prof. A. E. Taylor:[3] "The real difficulty felt by many . . . is not that the alleged event is unique, but precisely that it is *not* unique. Virgin Births are the most familiar of things to the anthropologist."

1. The Greek idea of a god's intercourse with a mortal woman.[4] This is loosely called "a Virgin Birth," but really refers to something different.

[1] So Zacharias, i. 67.

[2] I have put as delicately as possible the point which Leisegang makes. He quotes popular papyri which show that ψυχή was used euphemistically = *pudenda*. That the argument breaks down is too obvious to need emphasizing.

[3] In *Theology* of August, 1922, reviewing C. Harris' *Creeds or No Creeds*.

[4] *Cf.* Plut. *de Os. et Is.* καὶ ὅλως ἄρρενι θεῷ πρὸς γυναῖκα θνητὴν ἀπολείπουσιν ὁμιλίαν.

2. A special sense appears in Egypt so far back as the third millennium B.C. Amon-Re the sun-god comes to the queen in the person of her husband. By union with him she becomes a goddess. The son born is a manifestation of Horus; he grows up and becomes Pharaoh, child of the Sun. This idea passed over to the Ptolemies, and ultimately to the Cæsars. Clearly it originates in a national religion, which identifies the nation, and therefore the nation's ruler, with its god or gods.

3. There is evidence of a Semitic belief in a kind of angel or *jinn*, thought to be the father of a child born in the natural way.

4. It is stated—without adequate proof—that the Greek idea of a prophetess receiving inspiration was connected with the birth of a child.

5. The writers we have been discussing make considerable use of Philo's description of the patriarchs' wives, symbolizing virtues, as virgins. To examine his speculations would take us too far afield, but probably they are irrelevant to our problem.[1]

6. A mythological and astrological conception, traceable as far back, probably, as the Septuagint version of Isaiah, and perhaps further, of a divine Child born from a Virgin, exercised a potent influence during the first century A.D.

7. The New Testament story.[2]

Can the last be explained by any of the foregoing ?

1. Gen. vi. 2 shows that such ideas once had a place in Hebrew thought, but they are associated with extreme wickedness and were equally abhorrent to the later Jews and to the early Christians.

2. The special Egyptian idea reappeared in the imperial cult to which the early Church was so vehemently opposed; in any case it has no connection with a Virgin Birth.

3. The popular Semitic belief that certain children, born in the ordinary course of nature, really owed their paternity to a

[1] The chief passages are discussed in Gore, *Dissertations*, pp. 61-63, and, with English renderings, in Box, *The Virgin Birth*, pp. 232-235.

[2] No purpose would be served by an examination of Virgin births outside the Semitic and Hellenistic spheres of influence, but probably they could all be brought under the various heads mentioned above.

spirit or *jinn* is connected with a naïve, primitive idea which dissociates birth from intercourse. It is incredible that St. Luke the doctor could be influenced by such beliefs.[1]

4. It is incredible that St. Luke, who in Acts xvi. 16 describes a Pythoness (an ἐγγαστρίμυθος) as possessed with an evil spirit, was in any way affected by such Hellenistic beliefs in his description of the Annunciation.

5. Philo's symbolic interpretation of the Patriarchal stories is irrelevant.

6. If one wants to know what a myth of this kind looks like in a New Testament form, one need only turn to Apoc. xii., which differs *toto cælo* from the Birth narratives of the Gospels.[2]

7. We are driven to the conclusion that the Christian story of the Virgin Birth is something new,[3] not only in its delicacy and reticence, but also in its content. The divine heavenly Child with a Virgin Mother, whom popular expectation had set among the stars, is born of a Jewish mother who lived in Jerusalem, a familiar figure to many, during the early years of the Church.

[1] Some scholars hold that the medical language of the Lukan writings proves only that the writer used the vocabulary of a *well-educated man*; such a man would, equally with a doctor, despise primitive ignorance. *Cf.* H. J. D. Astley, *Biblical Anthropology*, p. 69: "The Arunta, in common with the other Australian tribes who hold the same belief in reincarnation, are totally ignorant of the meaning of the union of the sexes in marriage; this union only prepares the woman for the entry of the spirit-child at the appointed time."

[2] This is Meyer's summary (*Ursprung und Anfänge*, ii. 384 *ff.*). The events take place in heaven. The woman is "Virgo," with her diadem of 12 signs of the Zodiac. The dragon is the Hydra (also called δράκων), which moves four signs and thereby sweeps one-third of the stars from heaven. Behind this is the primitive conception of the spring vegetation as the work of a god, born in spring and rapidly growing. Hostile forces plot against him, trying to prevent his birth and devour him when born. Men protect him by religious rites. Eventually he is withered up by the summer sun. The myth is taken over by Jewish Christians, who apply it to Jesus. The writer of Apoc. uses it in a stereotyped form, with necessary adaptations. He has not seen it himself. Note the ὤφθη of xii. 1, as opposed to εἶδον elsewhere.

[3] Billerbeck in his massive Rabbinic Commentary on St. Matthew adduces no parallel.

VII

Let us now see if we can trace the Lukan[1] story of the Virgin Birth further back than the time of the composition of the Third Gospel, up to which, according to Dr. Vincent Taylor, it had existed as a secret tradition, unknown to St. Mark and St. Paul.

During the years 60 to 64[2] four persons of supreme importance for Christian origins were to be found at Rome—St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Mark and St. Luke. In that small community there would be no room for diverse views about matters of supreme importance. If, therefore, St. Paul and St. Mark had not heard of the Virgin Birth, presumably St. Luke was equally ignorant. So the story came to him later, and was accepted as credible, although the others with their local Palestinian knowledge had never heard of it, and he himself during his two years in Palestine, diligently searching out all things from the beginning, had failed to get on its track. Further, he must have known—the evidence discussed above makes this certain —that the expectation of such a birth was widely diffused in Gentile circles. Deliberately, then, he took over a secret tradition of which he knew St. Paul to have been ignorant, and which was liable to be associated with dangerous heathen myths.

I do not think this is credible. I suggest, on the contrary, an account of the mystery which is purely *a priori* speculation, but seems to me more probable than the general critical view.

When St. Luke went to Palestine, perhaps in 59, he found the story current in the Church of Jerusalem. At what period during the years 29-59 was it first told? Remember that St. James, the brother of the Lord, was presiding over the Church most of the time, and was in an influential position all the time. Is it likely that a myth would arise under his eyes regarding a subject so closely connected with his own family? He was intensely Jewish and, one imagines, the last man to tolerate the intrusion of Hellenistic or outworn Semitic myths

[1] No similar investigation of the Matthæan narrative is possible.
[2] These dates are not, of course, precise.

into the community. If we accept this as a probable statement of the facts, then St. Peter, St. Paul and St. Mark must have known the story.

A further question arises: When was it first divulged? A secret tradition might have been divulged any time during the thirty years. But there is a strong probability to my mind in favour of one particular date for its becoming known, namely the weeks and months following the Crucifixion. However we interpret the Resurrection-narratives, clearly the disciples then concluded that God had appointed Jesus Lord and Christ. He was in heaven for a while, but would shortly descend to set up His Kingdom. With this belief a host of other beliefs came in. To use Meyer's[1] words: "With the belief in Jesus as Messiah and coming Judge of the world were transferred to Him simultaneously all the mystical ideas and expressions which had developed in Judaism since Daniel. He is the Son of David, the Son of Man and the Son of God, chosen by God from the beginning as Redeemer and World-ruler, and therefore in the closest connection with God the Father." This surely is far more probable than a gradual evolution of these ideas. But would not this be the very moment when questions would be asked concerning the coming on earth of Jesus, which Mary His Mother would answer?[2] Here then I would place the first telling of the stories found in Luke i. and ii.

There remains a theoretical possibility that St. Mary told the story in a simple Old Testament manner, like the birth-stories of Ishmael and Samson, laying stress on the action of God to the exclusion of the human agent, and was wrongly taken to imply a virginal conception. Perhaps she, like Mary Magdalene testifying to the Resurrection, expressed herself inaccurately and was misunderstood. We can ascend the stream no further; in the last resort our answer to such suggestions depends upon whether we believe that the Spirit of Truth, and not that of error, brooded over the beginnings of Christianity.

Nor can we explain the silence of St. Mark and St. Paul. But is it unreasonable to suppose that the beauty and artistic reticence of St. Luke's two chapters reflect a certain beauty of character found in those holy and humble men of heart who

[1] *Ursprung und Anfänge*, iii. 236. [2] Acts i. 14.

passed over from Judaism to Christianity; that they, like Mary, pondered these things in their hearts but did not publish them abroad? In that case the Virgin Birth could not be expected to form part of the public preaching. What we may expect to find *is* found, a Christology in every way congruous with the sacred mystery. In the light of what we have said about Hellenistic beliefs, reserve was necessary in imparting this religious knowledge.

II

THE " FORMGESCHICHTLICH " METHOD

AFTER the War a new school of Synoptic criticism developed in Germany, which can best be described by reviewing the books of its chief exponents.[1]

I

K. L. Schmidt's book on the framework of the Synoptic tradition (*Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, Berlin, 1919) has attracted little notice in England, in spite of its originality. His special subject, which is discussed in great detail, is the connecting links between the different sections of the Gospels. The main body of Mark, for example, is held to be a collection of short liturgical *pericopes*, themselves of great historical value, connected by chronological and geographical links which are seldom historical. We can trace the remains of an Itinerary of Jesus in the framework, but that is all. No reliance can be placed on Mark's scheme, which is as arbitrary in its one-year as John's in its three-year theory. For example, the Cleansing of the Temple is timeless. All the primitive tradition knew was that Jesus protested vigorously against the abuses of the sanctuary when He saw them. Mark, bound by his theory of a one-year ministry, is obliged to date the Cleansing in the final visit to Jerusalem; John, not so bound, as naturally puts it in the first visit. Many indications point to a far longer ministry than is allowed by Mark's scheme: the preaching to Chorazin, incidentally alluded to in Matt. xi. 21, Peter's answer in Matt. xvii. 25 that his Master was accustomed to pay

[1] I leave the following section as it appeared in *Theology*, May, 1925. It at least has the value of being an independent first impression. For far fuller and more competent guidance I refer the reader to B. S. Easton, *The Gospel before the Gospels* (1928).

the Temple tax, the many adherents in Jerusalem presupposed by the Markan Passion-narrative, etc.[1]

Considerable space would be required in order to do justice to Schmidt's destructive criticism of the Markan framework. It is very convincing. Three general considerations may, however, be put forward: (*a*) Matthew and Luke allow themselves the utmost freedom in altering the order and even locality of sections which are otherwise retained faithfully. Clearly they attached no importance to this side of Mark's work. (*b*) Papias, in words that are persistently neglected, tells us that Mark wrote down his reminiscences of Peter's teaching " not however in order." (*c*) Augustine (*de Cons. Evan.* ii. 21 *f.*) says that the Evangelists wrote in the order in which God recalled the several narratives to them. Thus we need not suppose that the evening " when the sun did set " of Mark i. 32 was the same evening in which Jesus healed Peter's mother-in-law (*v.* 31). This is precisely the manner in which Schmidt treats the Markan notes of time.

If Mark's famework is worthless historically, as artificial as John's, his Gospel remains the earliest and best. Matthew, as is obvious, grouped his material for liturgical convenience. Luke, who claims to write " in order " (i. 3), is plainly even further removed from the original course of events than Mark.

[1] The chronology of our Lord's life is far from fixed. (i.) C. H. Turner shows that five lines of converging evidence bring up to A.D. 29 for the Crucifixion: Meyer (*Ursprung und Anfänge*, iii. 171) says 27 is the latest possible date. (ii.) A census in Egypt is attested for A.D. 19 to 20, and these censuses took place every fourteen years. We can therefore argue back with plausibility to earlier censuses in A.D. 5 to 6 and 10 to 9 B.C. (Mitteis-Wilcken). The last date would make room for a much longer ministry than is usually assumed. (iii.) " About thirty years " in Luke iii. 23 would cover any age from twenty-eight to thirty-two (Turner). (iv.) Loisy's exegesis of John ii. 20, viii. 57 is as follows: " Forty-six years was this temple in building "—the Evangelist explains of the temple of His body, that is, Jesus was forty-six at the first passover. Three years later at the end of the Ministry He was not yet fifty, that is forty-nine, years old. At the Resurrection He completed seven by seven years (mystically) and entered upon the jubilee. (v.) Irenæus (II., xxii. 3-6) distinctly says that the elders had a tradition of a long ministry.

I do not seriously propose that we should take the earliest possible date for the Birth, the earliest for the Baptism, and the latest for the Crucifixion, but I want to remind the reader of the uncertainty of even the most careful reconstructions.

Some deduction must be made for the rhetorical nature of his preface, but he apparently aims at a psychological rather than historical order, except in ix.-xviii. where he shows traces of becoming tired of the effort.

Some of Schmidt's work is marred by excessive scepticism. In places, so he owns, Mark tells a story in the very words of Peter. It is only reasonable to suppose that the Apostle remembered the order of events to some extent. But in the main his book is helpful and convincing. Thus he draws a most attractive picture of Gospel origins. The disciples are gathered for worship and edification. The Old Testament is read as a holy book. Confessing Jesus as Messiah and Lord, they feel the need of rehearsing His acts and words. One relates a tale, and when he finishes a second begins with " And it came to pass that . . ." The separate tales are told time after time till they become stereotyped; each begins with " and." Finally, the Evangelist Mark strings together the detached tales, providing a literary framework as best he can.

The Passion Narrative is on a different footing. When the Passover came round the whole story had to be told. A *continua lectio* was formed, such as would answer the question, How came the Messiah to be treated so by His own people ?

Schmidt finds the two-source hypothesis (Mark and Q) too rigid. The tales continued to be told long after the earliest Gospel was written. It would not be accurate to say that he rehabilitates John; but by depreciating the notes of time and place in Mark he shows that those in John have as good a chance of being true.

Bultmann's *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (Göttingen, 1921) uses a method similar to Schmidt's to investigate separately the history of *groups* of material; sayings, for example, may have a quite different history from miracle-stories. He starts from the undoubted fact that, as Matthew-Luke altered Mark and Q, so these had in their time altered the previous tradition.

There is a class of sections which we may call Apophthegmata, where the words are central and the framework secondary. Thus, in Mark ii. 3-12, 5 *b*-10 is a later insertion, as is

shown by the repetition of the words " he saith to the sick of the palsy," at which the cut was made. It was built up round the logion " The Son of Man hath authority on earth to forgive sins," which it was thought well to introduce here. In Mark ii. 23-28, 27 and 28 form an originally isolated logion. The rest of the section is of literary origin, dating from the period of Jewish-Christian controversies in the early Church. The disciples[1] are accused of a wrong attitude towards the Sabbath. They justify themselves by a saying of their Master attached to an authentic logion.

In another group of passages the answer is central, the question and connecting links being secondary. The best authenticated words of Jesus are those in which He speaks like a Jewish wise man in the style of Proverbs.

We may dispute about the more or less, but the general tendency of tradition cannot be denied; it adds, modifies, and combines freely. We can place no confidence even in Q. The Church has picked up popular sayings and ascribed them to Jesus. Some, such as that of the old wine and new bottles, were in common use in a secular connection, and have been given a religious stamp. The first aim was to make a collection of edifying sayings for teaching purposes. Only later were they ascribed to Jesus. If He used them, they were not characteristic, and can be paralleled in the Rabbis.[2] Some are valuable, but Bultmann allows himself to describe them as " filled now with a sober, popular morality, now with naïve egoism " (p. 62). Just as the Apocalypse of Mark xiii. is already existing material ascribed to Jesus, so various prophetic utterances were treated.[3] Much was collected from all quarters and put into the mouth of the Ascended Christ, speaking to the Church. That is, what is generally conceded as a possible explanation of parts of the Fourth Gospel is demanded for the first three. The last stage is the Sermon on the Mount, which is a Catechism.

In the course of a very long and tedious book Bultmann

[1] Not Jesus. Had the incident been historical Jesus would have been accused.

[2] Billerbeck's immense collection of material disposes of this contention.

[3] But Matt. xxiii. is excluded, being obviously genuine !

discredits most of our Lord's sayings. Either he can show how they arose, or the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* have a more original version, or Jewish parallels can be traced, or an application to circumstances of the early Church pointed out. Each argument by itself may be plausible: the whole is sufficiently refuted by a *quod est absurdum*.

The miracle-stories are of literary origin. The Old Testament has contributed little. A very elaborate list of parallels and analogies is printed, which illustrate the atmosphere which made possible the pressing in of popular tales.

Bultmann's conclusion is as follows. A collection of sayings was made at a very early period in the Palestinian Church, the favourite literary form, that of Proverbs, being employed. Jesus appears in them as a teacher of " wisdom " and eschatology. In Q, a later stage of this primitive tradition, miracle-stories are practically absent. Mark, on the contrary, gives us a divine man walking on earth. His stories are Hellenistic in origin. There was nothing resembling a " gospel " in his sources. A Christ-myth was needed, so he took over various cult-legends which had already been incorporated in the tradition, and fitted some of the Logia into them. Many parallels can be found, for great characters have a power of attracting floating material to themselves. Thus in parts of rural Germany popular old-world legends are told of Bismarck.

The two books just discussed are typical examples of the new school of German Synoptic criticism. Fortunately, a full monograph upon it has been published, E. Fascher's *Die formgeschichtliche Methode* (Giessen, 1924.) The long discussions about terminology are so arid that readers may welcome a brief explanation. Wendling and von Soden (and Herder long ago) pointed the way, but only recently have scholars explored it. The purpose of the method is " to investigate the oral tradition of the matter fixed in literary form in the Synoptic Gospels." It has been fully tested in the field of folklore. As regards the New Testament, it applies to the Synoptic Gospels only. During their pre-literary stage all the essential features of folklore are to be found. *Literaturgeschichte* being plainly inappropriate, *Formgeschichte* is coined.

The most important books besides Schmidt's and Bultmann's are Dibelius' *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (1919), Albertz' *Die synoptischen Streitgespräche* (1921), and Bertram's *Die Leidensgeschichte Jesu und der Christuskult : Eine formgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (1922). Dibelius defines his quest as that of " little literary units." Each section has a separate history, which can be traced by criticism. In one part of the Gospels we have deposited the primitive preaching. This can be divided into (*a*) " paradigms," stock tales and illustrations of the preacher (for example, Mark ii. 1 *ff.*, ii. 18 *ff.*, etc.), (*b*) proofs from Scripture, (*c*) exhortations to repentance, (*d*) descriptions produced to satisfy the special interest in the Passion and Easter. We must distinguish between these stories told for their own sake as homiletical material and those which merely enshrine a saying. The " Novelle " and " Wundergeschichten " are a different literary form, and have no religious value to speak of.

Albertz specializes on the controversial arguments in the Synoptists, Bertram on the Passion-history. Tradition, Bertram considers, was formed by the needs of the worshipping community. By cult he understands " the inner relation of the faithful to their cult-hero."

Fascher sums up the results so far. Certain types of " form " have been discovered—controversy, miracle-tale, sayings, etc. —and illustrated from Hellenistic and Rabbinic literature. These " forms " were immensely important in antiquity. The man who tells sayings in a gnomic form will change instinctively to a flowing style when he comes to a " wonder-tale." *When the form conflicts with historical accuracy, the form wins.* This is, I think, the gist of the theory.

As regards source-criticism : The main division is not between Q and Mark, but between story-material and sayings-material. But each section is a separate source. Q contains both Palestinian and Hellenistic material. No one author is responsible for it; it appears in very different guise in Matthew and Luke. Q is a convenient term for certain strata of the tradition. It developed before and after Mark; also between Luke and Matthew. As Dibelius puts it, " Q ist keine Schrift, sondern eine Schicht " (not a writing but a stratum).

Clearly Synoptic criticism has struck its tents and is on the march once more. It is annoying to be obliged to reconsider the two-document hypothesis just when it has got into the text-books, but Canon Streeter from one side, the post-war Germans from another, have shaken it seriously. The *formgeschichtlich* method has come to stay. In Schmidt's hands it produces relatively conservative results, Bultmann is Strauss *redivivus*. We need not take Bultmann very seriously. One cannot distinguish between Jewish and Hellenistic elements in the way he does. And any theory which makes the early Church greater than Jesus—for this is the effect of his book—is self-condemned. The wonderful words of the Gospel, which still go forth on their campaign of conquest throughout the world, cannot be the distillation by the early Church of Rabbinic and Hellenistic gnomic sayings and popular tales.

Nor need we be frightened of the word " folklore." Presumably it describes the mind-movements of non-literary humanity, instinctive rather than reflective. That the early Christians valued edification rather than history, that with unerring instinct they shaped the tradition in such a way as best to rouse the sluggish minds of ordinary folk and train their souls for heaven—this we have known for a long while. In this sense we can grant that the principles of folklore may well be applied to the pre-literary stage of Synoptic tradition. Again, that the Gospels are rather preachers' and catechists' manuals than history books will readily be granted. But we believe that the Holy Spirit of Truth brooded over both literary and non-literary stages in the building of the New Testament, and that He controlled the instinctive movements of plain men's minds during the swift successive stages of that mighty Revolution which was accomplished as the disciples thought out the implications of the Life, Death, and Resurrection of Jesus.

The one certain result, to my mind, of this recent work is that a chronological Life of Christ, tracing His mental development from Baptism to the Cross, has become impossible. The very best Lives are now obsolete. If I am justified in my conclusion, I am sure many scholars will breathe a sigh of relief on finding themselves absolved from a burdensome and thankless task.

II

The method can be illustrated in a very simple way from a familiar experience; κατ' ἄνθρωπον λέγω.

A beloved father, who has been living alone since his wife's death, falls ill. His children are summoned and a few days after their arrival he dies. They remain in the house for a week or two, winding up his affairs. There is singularly little with which to reconstruct the dead man's career; no letters (for he consistently destroyed them), no newspaper-cutting book, no diary. The children are thrown back on their personal memories of their father. During the days that follow his death their conversation largely consists of " Do you remember . . . ?" Their stock of information falls under four heads.

1. Clearest of all is the sequence of events and sayings in the last days. These are the common property of the family and there is little opening for subsequent lapses of memory in respect of them.

2. Another stock of common memories consists of recollections of childhood's days in the old home. As the sons and daughters talk over the past a corporate memory is formed, one filling up gaps in the recollection of the others. Probably in years to come the mental image that survives will be largely the memories of childhood as defined, perhaps modified, during these days.

3. Each child will have his or her contribution to make towards the reconstruction of the middle years. The one who was most in his father's confidence, or who was most at home, will be primarily responsible for the version that is accepted as the family tradition.

4. There will be stories contributed from outside the family which they are unable to check. Most of this information will be accepted without question; it is clearly in keeping with the character of the deceased. Some stories will be instinctively rejected—" I am sure he never said that." Among the stories accepted and henceforward incorporated into the tradition there may be some that are inaccurate or even legendary,

floating material that has attached itself to the wrong person. But if it has been accepted by the family we may be certain it is not misleading.[1]

Let us suppose that after a few years one of the sons sits down to write an account of his father from memory. His memory will play him false in unimportant details. He will get dates wrong. In particular the middle years will tend to fade. What will be quite clear in his mind will be: (1) the last illness; (2) his childhood impressions as corroborated and amplified at the time of the funeral; (3) certain " family sayings," characteristic jokes and utterances which his father repeated frequently; (4) and, I think we may add, certain striking anecdotes contributed by outsiders to the family circle, which by their very novelty struck the imagination of the children.

The thing remembered will be predominantly the mental images formed during the days following the father's death. It was then that the tradition was moulded in its permanent form. As a rule in such cases nothing of importance is added subsequently.

My point is this. The process of thought between the father's death and the resolve to commit the tradition to writing is an example of *Formgeschichte*. All the elements are here, even to the possible intrusion of legends.

Let us see how this applies to the Gospels, confining ourselves to St. Mark, not to introduce complications. Whatever our belief as to the Resurrection appearances, we must all agree that the weeks following the Crucifixion were a supremely formative period, in which conclusions were reached that have dominated the subsequent history of the Church. I believe that the tradition was fixed in its main outlines almost at once.

Note (1) that more than half the Second Gospel, viii. 27 to the end, describes the events of the last few weeks of Our Lord's life. Then note (2)—following the classification above —that i. 16-39 apparently describes the events of the first few hours—Friday afternoon to Sunday morning—spent by St. Peter in the company of Jesus, and can be put into *oratio*

[1] *Cf.* the cycle of stories attached to Frederick Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury. Probably his own son would not dare to say of many a one for which he could not vouch, " This is legendary."

recta spoken by Peter in a convincing way. But (3) the middle period is less clear. It is interesting to notice that in the section vii. 1-viii. 26, which is full of unsolved problems, no disciple is mentioned by name; we only have " the disciples " or " they." In vii. 24-37 no companion is mentioned; possibly the chief apostles had to depend upon second-hand information. But the striking sayings of this period are undisputably authentic. Incorporated into the tradition is certain material that comes under our heading (4). Thus for the details of the trials before the high priest and Pilate the disciples must have been dependent upon sources outside their own circle. None of their body could vouch for the story of John the Baptist's death, which evidently comes from the disciples of John and may have been sensibly modified in tradition. In this way we can account for the fixing of nearly all the tradition surviving in St. Mark during the first few months, or even weeks, of the Church's life. That the tradition was fixed by the Apostolic band is rendered probable by the absence from it of all material concerned with the life of Jesus before His ministry began.

In our illustration from modern life the man who began to write would soon run up against the limits of memory. In the few years that had elapsed since his father's death much was irrevocably lost. But in the primitive Church at Jerusalem there was an extraordinary, even an increasing, enthusiasm. The personality of Jesus was vividly present. As " they that feared the Lord spoke often one to another " hidden memories came to the surface; new meanings were seen in clearly remembered scenes and words. We cannot exclude even from the earliest tradition of all[1] the possibility that the new meaning thus seen sometimes modified the account given of an incident in the Ministry. But everything was in favour of the preservation of what was valuable. In three directions the tendency would be strengthened. (i.) The first Passover after the Crucifixion must have been of epoch-making importance for Gospel origins. As the anniversary drew near, memories would be quickened and the story would be retold. I find it hard to believe that much of importance was added to the Markan tradition of the last days after Easter A.D. 30, or 31,

[1] Few would care to exclude it from the Fourth Gospel.

according to our system of chronology. (ii.) Shortly after this, in all probability, began the Hellenistic movement identified with Stephen, and the beginnings of the break with Judaism. The controversy with Pharisaism, questions about ceremonial purification, the Sabbath, etc.—all this would create problems which would at once make the Christians ask "What did Jesus do, or say, about this?" One of the main contentions of the *formgeschichtlich* school is that each section of the Gospel is to be studied on its own merits and we must ask each time what concrete situation in the early Church was responsible for it. The new point of view is really helpful; we can accept the position that the selective fixing of certain memories of Our Lord's Ministry was thus due to the practical needs of the early Church. (iii.) One day, after St. Peter or another disciple had told some reminiscences, someone said: "Let me write that down." In an age of writing this would be the most natural thing in the world. When all has been said about the wonderful memory of Orientals, or about the expectation of the Parousia making it unnecessary to commit tradition to writing, it still remains probable that someone would have written down stories about Jesus. After all, St. Luke says that *many* took in hand to draw up narrations, and Two Documents, or even Four, seem insufficient to justify his statement.

I am aware that all this is very speculative, but at least sometimes it is helpful to give rein to our imaginations, to remember that the Apostles were men of like passions with ourselves, and to ask what we should have done in their place. That the *formgeschichtlich* method has been used to support very sceptical conclusions is no argument against its intrinsic value.[1]

[1] The whole of section ii. came to me in a dream. Though not so good as it seemed to me on waking, I have thought it worth reproducing. This piece of private information is not altogether irrelevant in a serious work. I imagine that the dream was far more honoured in Bible times than now, and that the mind responded to what was expected of it. I see no reason why authors should not have sometimes dreamed parts of their works and have taken them as revelation the order of which they were in honour bound to preserve. The Apocalypse is far more credible to me as the product of the dream mind than as a piece of literary scissors and paste in which we may

III

Lastly let me record a striking suggestion made by Dr. Dibelius in his *Geschichtliche und übergeschichtliche Religion im Christentum* (Göttingen, 1925). Influenced by Otto and Barth, he defines the Gospel as the breaking through of otherworldly reality in the person of Jesus. We Western men have no vocabulary with which to describe Jesus. Our concepts, based ultimately on Greek thought, are too intellectual. We instinctively imagine Jesus discoursing with His disciples like a Socrates. In point of fact, He was neither a Rabbi disputing, nor a leader with a following, nor a prophet to be believed, but a Holy Man, round whom His disciples clustered in awe, seeing in Him an intimation of eternity. We may imagine them very often silent before Him and only rarely daring to ask a question. The recorded sayings of Jesus are not conversations, but short pronouncements called forth by specific occasions. A most significant passage is Mark x. 32: " Jesus was going before them; and they were amazed; and they that followed were afraid." In short—the word is now inevitable—His was a *numinous* figure.

Dibelius does not attempt to prove his suggestion; the evidence is insufficient. But anyone reading St. Mark again, keeping this idea in mind, and looking out for words like θαμβεῖσθαι, φοβεῖσθαι, etc., will be surprised to find how well it fits the facts. And it is an enormous help in explaining the attribution of divine traits to Jesus immediately after the Crucifixion if He had been known to the disciples not as a sociable comrade, but as a figure shrouded in mystery and regarded with awe. That silence would be appropriate in a Holy Man is clear from Acts xiv. 12, where the men of Lystra call Paul, who had preached and healed a man, Hermes the

---

trace the bungles of a stupid editor. Or, a variant of the same theory, parts of the Bible may be " day-dreams," the actual writing having been in a manner " automatic." So Madame Guyon and other mystics wrote some of their works. In such conditions there is no necessary suspension of the governing, rational faculty, although the person concerned may think there is.

messenger of the gods, and Barnabas, who had remained in the background, the supreme god Zeus.

If there is anything in this suggestion, and if further we press the thought that a good teacher repeats himself, then there is ground for supposing that the earliest Synoptic tradition, which I believe crystallized soon after the Crucifixion, included practically all the teaching of Jesus.

III

THREE MARKAN TEXTS

(*a*) vi. 3: οὐχ οὗτος ὁ τέκτων, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Μαρίας . . .; *Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary . . .?*

THE conception of the carpenter of Nazareth has had a potent influence in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It has been used as a kind of stick with which to beat the Church. The Lord you pretend to worship was a working man, it is said, one of the proletariat, and popes and prelates cannot pretend to represent Him truly. In view of this widespread feeling it is worth while to enquire what precisely a Nazareth carpenter was and did. And, quite apart from it, every Christian must feel an intense interest in the earthly conditions of our Lord's life.

This passage of St. Mark is our only authority for our Lord's occupation. The parallel passage of St. Matthew (xiii. 55) leaves a strong presumption that He followed Joseph's trade, but only says: "Is not this the carpenter's son?" Origen, challenged by Celsus, said, "Nowhere in the gospels current in the Churches is Jesus Himself described as a carpenter"; so the copies of St. Mark known to him had evidently been assimilated to St. Matthew, as have been some MSS. still preserved. The First Gospel's modification of St. Mark has been attributed by some to a feeling that it was undignified to represent Jesus as a manual labourer. Such a feeling is unlikely to have arisen in the Jewish-Christian circles from which the First Gospel originated. Still more unlikely is the suggestion that "son of the carpenter" is Semitic for "carpenter." Probably "the carpenter's son" is a mere variation with no special significance for "the carpenter, the son of Mary." It is worth noticing that in the mouth of detractors "son of Mary" may have had an invidious meaning. To mention the mother's name in place of the father's was most

unusual and would convey the imputation that Joseph was not the real father of Jesus.

The original meaning of τέκτων, like that of the Hebrew *ḥārāsh*, which it always represents in the LXX, was a worker in stone, wood, or other material, according to context. The Latin "faber," which translates it in the Vulgate, is similarly used. The following examples illustrate the use of τέκτων: 2 Sam. v. 11, ἀπέστειλεν . . . τέκτονας ξύλων καὶ τέκτονας λίθων, "carpenters and masons"; 1 Chron. xxii. 15, οἰκοδόμοι λίθων καὶ τέκτονες ξύλων; 2 Chron. xxiv. 12, ἐμισθοῦντο λατόμους καὶ τέκτονας; Sirach xxxviii. 27, πᾶς τέκτων καὶ ἀρχιτέκτων, "every artificer and work-master" [Heb. "he that maketh carved work and cunning device" (Oesterley)]. The two passages already quoted are the only occurrences in the New Testament. The word is not found in the Apostolic Fathers, and occurs once in the Apologists—Justin *c. Tryphone*, lxxxviii: ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ τεκτονικὰ ἔργα εἰργάζετο, ὢν ἐν ἀνθρώποις, ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγά, "He worked these works of a carpenter while He was among men, ploughs, and yokes."

The last passage bears witness to an early tradition that Jesus was a carpenter in the sense of a worker in wood. So does Celsus when he remarks that Jesus, being a carpenter, was nailed to the wood of the Cross. Milligan and Moulton (*Expositor*, VIII. ii. 275 *ff.*) quote a fourth-century papyrus in favour of this limited sense.

But there were other traditions in the early Church. St. Hilary on Matt. xiii. 55 says Joseph was a blacksmith ("fabri erat filius ferrum igne vincentis"). St. Ambrose's comment on Luke iii. 23 seems to consider Jesus was a builder ("hoc typo patrem sibi esse demonstrat qui fabricator omnium condidit mundum"). A remarkable passage in the Acts of Thomas (ch. 3) has not often been quoted by commentators. Thomas, as well as Jesus, is a τέκτων, working under Him as a slave. Abbanes buys Him and asks: Ποίαν ἐργασίαν οἶδας; ὁ δὲ ἔφη· Ἐν μέν ξύλοις ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγοὺς καὶ τρυτάνας καὶ πλοῖα καὶ κώπας πλοίων καί ἱστοὺς καί τροχίσκους, ἐν δὲ λίθοις στήλας τε καὶ ναοὺς καὶ πραιτώρια βασιλικά ("What work do you know? He said, In wood—ploughs and yokes and scales and boats and ship's oars and

masts and wheels; and in stone—slabs and temples and royal residences") Lipsius-Bonnet II. ii. 103. A little later (ch. 17, II. ii. 125), the same is repeated in similar language: *ποίαν τέχνην ἐπίστασαι; λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ ἀπόστολος· τὴν τεκτονικὴν καὶ τὴν οἰκοδομικὴν . . . καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν· Οἰκοδομεῖς μοι παλάτιον; ὁ δε ἀπεκρίθη· Ναί, οἰκοδομῶ καὶ τελίσκω· διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ἦλθον, οἰκοδομῆσαι καὶ τεκτονεῦσαι.*

The *τέκτων* here is a builder, working in wood and stone. The special sense of *τεκτονικὴν* and *τεκτονεῦσαι* in the second quotation seems to be the architect's work rather than one department of the builder's work. The entry in a Modern Greek Lexicon is instructive: "*τέκτων*· A carpenter (for building): overseer of buildings; architect; *οἱ* (*ἐλεύθεροι*) *τέκτονες* the (free) masons."

So far the evidence is equally balanced; and *τέκτων* in the Gospels may be considered to mean either a builder who included carpentering among his works or a carpenter in the restricted sense. There remains a consideration which seems to weigh down the scales in favour of the wider sense. Wood is and was scarce in Palestine. "Houses were made of bricks or clay; but hewn stone was not uncommon" (*Encyclopædia Biblica*, art. "Handicrafts"). "At the present day clay-bricks are used in the plain, stone in the mountains" (art. "House"). This leads us to suppose that *τέκτων* in the Gospels unqualified by any material is not restricted to a worker in wood. If our Lord was a builder, passages like Matt. vii. 24-27, the parable of the two houses, and Matt. xvi. 18, "Upon this rock I will build My Church," acquire a new meaning.

In any case our Lord would have been a small master-man, working with His hands but also planning the work and responsible for its success on the business side. He must have bought His materials from merchants and have known the difficulty of financing an enterprise. He must have sent out bills and insisted on their being paid, knowing that otherwise His own responsibilities could not be met. It is suggested that the references to business in the parables are based on personal experience as well as on observation of others. Insisting as a general rule on debtors paying up, He may well

have found it wise as well as kind to say to a customer in difficulties: "Take thy bill and write four score." Jesus was the Ideal Business Man as well as the Ideal Workman.

(*b*) ix. 4: *There appeared unto them Elijah with Moses.*

The Transfiguration has attracted a good deal of attention lately.[1] Twenty years ago advanced critics were inclined to regard the story as mythical. To-day, when so much interest is taken in psychic phenomena, some not only find it credible but build a heavy superstructure on it. Frequently it is said to have been a Resurrection appearance. E. Meyer even maintains that "the Resurrection and the appearances of the Risen Lord have grown out of the Transfiguration; it is the final root of Christianity" (*Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, i. 156).

One question only is asked here: What is the significance of Moses and Elijah? If St. Mark is the original source, and St. Matthew and St. Luke are secondary, then Elijah is the primary figure, to whom Moses is joined. The later writers naturally arrange the two in chronological order. Elijah was the typical prophet, whose return was to usher in the Day of the Lord (Mal. iv. 5). But Moses was a prophet too (see Deut. xviii. 15, xxxiv. 10; Hos. xii. 13), and to our Lord he was presumably a prophet first and foremost. It may be noted that in the Sermon on the Mount, which is so largely concerned with the attitude of the citizens of the new Kingdom towards the old law, Moses is not mentioned; though Matt. xxiii. 2, Mark x. 3 describe him as a law-giver. That these two figures appear in the narrative of the Transfiguration must presumably be connected with the belief that neither died in the ordinary course of nature: Moses was supposed to have been taken up into heaven (*cf.* the Assumption of Moses and Jude 9), and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven. In 2 Macc. ii. 7, 8 a prophecy, put into the mouth of Jeremiah, said: "Yea and the place shall be unknown until God gather the people again together, and mercy come; and then shall the Lord

[1] This note is suggested by an article in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1921, by F. J. Badcock.

disclose these things, and the glory of the Lord shall be seen, and the cloud, as also it was showed with Moses . . ." (R.V. margin). The cloud that is associated with Moses was destined to reappear in the last days.

In what sense are we to suppose that the disciples *saw* Elijah and Moses? Any perception of disembodied spirits—such most readers would regard them, though the narrator may have thought of them as retaining bodies—must be on the pyschic or spiritual plane. Whatever took place was primarily in our Lord's consciousness. We may suppose that the two great figures of God's people in the past were vividly present to Him—Moses the first of the prophets, Elijah the prophet who should herald the Messianic age—and that He communed with them in the spirit. For a brief space the disciples were able to enter into our Lord's consciousness and see with His eyes. Then their faith failed, and the vision passed; or, perhaps, He thought of other things, and the link which connected them with the unseen world was forthwith snapped. The cloud was not so much a material as a psychic cloud, if the expression may be allowed; though the great mystics would have felt no need to apologize for such a conception.

If such suggestions as these have any weight, the conversation on the way down from the mountain becomes less puzzling. Jesus plainly declares that Elijah is John the Baptist. If we take the appearance of Elijah at the Transfiguration in at all a literal sense, it is exceedingly difficult to see how he and John Baptist can be identified. The difficulty is removed if we may imagine our Lord's mind brooding now on the historic Elijah, now on his present-day counterpart.

The reader may recall a curious book published some years ago entitled *An Adventure*. Two ladies visited Versailles and had a strange psychic experience. They saw sights and heard sounds which had been non-existent since the eighteenth century. The story was ultimately pieced together after laborious research amongst old maps and records. They were inclined to explain what happened by supposing they had become *en rapport* with the mind of Marie Antoinette, as it was at a certain critical period. The book attracted wide attention at the time, and its *bona fide* character was undoubted.

There is a good deal of evidence of a similar character, cogent to some minds, unsatisfying to others, illustrating what has been written above. The supposition that the mode in which the disciples experienced the Transfiguration was a sharing by them of a process taking place in our Lord's mind at least deserves to be considered.

(*c*) x. 13-16.

> It fell upon a summer's day,
> When Jesus walked in Galilee,
> The mothers from a village brought
> Their children to His knee.

So sings Stopford Brooke in a beautiful poem, which, like the familiar pictures, is based on St. Luke, with his mention of *βρέφη*, *babes*. But how did the first readers of St. Mark understand the story? Here, as so often, to read a passage of St. Mark with preconceptions so far as possible put away yields interesting results.

They were bringing to Him—*προσέφερον* is impersonal, as St. Matthew's interpretation, *προσηνέχθησαν*, shows. *boys*—this fairly represents *παιδία*. In ch. v. *παιδίον* is used of a twelve-year-old girl; in vii. 28 of children generally; in vii. 30 of a girl (age not specified); in ix. 24 of a boy who had been possessed since childhood, *ἐκ παιδιόθεν*; in ix. 36 of a child (neither age nor sex specified). *that He should touch them*—"touch," *ἅπτομαι*, in every instance in Mark has reference to Christ's healing touch. As the sequel shows, and as Matthew interprets, spiritual blessing is meant. We are reminded of the blessing given by Rabbis to their disciples, and of Old Testament blessings. The Hebrew "blessing" was regarded as a means of grace, not a mere outward sign. *But the disciples were rebuking them*. *αὐτοῖς* may refer either to the unexpressed subject of *προσέφερον* (fathers presumably—it is a safe rule not to introduce women into a Bible scene unless they are specified), or to the boys themselves. The latter interpretation is more probable. While *παιδίον* may cover any age from infancy (Matt. ii. 8) to early manhood (John xxi. 5), it most naturally refers to the middle period, since other words are available for the two extremes. In Mark v. and Luke ii. 27

it is used of a twelve-year old child, and this age best fits our passage. The boys had reached the age when the innocence of childhood had not passed and the deeper desires of manhood were forming. Though brought by their parents, as was the child Jesus to the Temple, they pressed forward eagerly to receive the blessings they were old enough to appreciate. That is to say, the practical application of the passage for us is to Confirmation rather than Baptism. Why did the disciples " rebuke " the boys ? Some writers suppose they did not want the Master troubled, but that would hardly explain His anger. It was natural, at the spiritual stage they had reached, that they did not want the Master's " blessing " to be given freely to every one that asked, without preliminary sifting and teaching.

But Jesus seeing it grew angry, and said to them, Let the boys come to Me, forbid them not. The last words, μὴ κωλύετε, show that the above interpretation was correct. They recur in Luke ix. 50, where Christ says that a man who follows not with the disciples is not to be regarded as outside the kingdom; the incident follows immediately upon that of the child set in the midst. *For of such is the kingdom of heaven*—" such " means " of them and those like them." Matt. v. 3 is a close parallel, " blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." The kingdom belongs to those who are spiritually poor and with utter humility receive it as a gift from God.

All this is obvious enough and hardly worth saying. But for the next verse I want to suggest an interpretation which does not seem to be given in the commentaries. *Verily I say unto you, Whosoever does not receive the kingdom of God ὡς παιδίον shall not enter therein.* It is assumed that the sentence in full is " as a boy receives it "; so the Vulgate, " velut parvulus." The meaning then is: A boy is conscious of his poverty, he owes all to his elders, and receives nothing by merit. So must you receive the kingdom, if you are to enter it at all.

This is good sense and can fairly be extracted from the Greek, though, like many apparently simple passages of the Gospels, it is unexpectedly difficult when pondered. " Receiving " and " entering " are completely different metaphors;

why should you need to enter into what you have already received? I suggest, therefore, that τὸ παιδίον is not a nominative at all, but an accusative. "As a boy" means "in the form of a boy." This is far more pointed. Our Lord has just said that the kingdom belongs to these and such-like boys. Here then it is, appearing undetected before their eyes. Interpreting St. Mark by himself, we turn back to ix. 36, 37 and our view is confirmed. Our Lord takes a boy, puts him in the midst of them, and says: "Whosoever receives one of such boys in my name, receives me." "In My name" means "as representing me." Now in Luke xvii. 21 we read: "The kingdom of God is in your midst," that is, in the person of Me, its representative.[1] Taking the two passages together and comparing them with Mark x. 14, we see the point of our passage. δέξηται is an unnatural word to use of things, but thoroughly in place as applied to persons. "Whosoever refuses to receive the kingdom when it comes to them in the form of eager boys pressing forward for a blessing," as you have refused, shall not enter therein. The harshness of the two expressions disappears. "Enter" refers to the kingdom to come, in its eschatological sense: "receive" to the *persons* in whom (in a measure, as in Jesus fully) it already was manifested by anticipation.

And putting His arm around them (ἀγκάλη is the bend of the arm) *He was blessing them, laying hands on them*, as Jacob blessed Ephraim and Manasseh.

May I suggest that the passage, interpreted as above, might be profitably used for meditation by a priest before taking a Confirmation class? In the fullness of his theological knowledge and spiritual experience he may easily forget how precious a thing immature faith is. *Maxima debetur pueris reverentia.* Yes, and the Gospel story shows us the precept worked out in life by God Incarnate.

[1] The other rendering is very difficult. Would Jesus have said to the Pharisees: "The kingdom of God is in *your* hearts"? Much less would Christian tradition with its anti-Pharisaic polemic have invented such a statement.

IV

"A PROPHET LIKE UNTO ME"

NO harder problem is set theologians than to ascertain what precisely was the Messianic consciousness of Our Lord. At each step we are confronted with the difficulty of distinguishing the original meaning of a saying or episode from the interpretation placed upon it in the Gospels by those who had come to a fuller realization of what Jesus was. So we try to find firm standing places in the morass of difficulties. I suggest that there are five of these, that the first is the firmest and that the others diminish in solidity in the order given.

1. It is generally recognized now that Our Lord called Himself Son of Man at the close of His ministry, in reference to Dan. vii. 13 and the amplification of the Heavenly Man conception in later Judaism which Ethiopic Enoch illustrates. He believed, that is, that He would come again in glory to inaugurate the Kingdom of God. Bousset's attempt to get rid of all the Son of Man passages is seen to be a failure. But we cannot insist on the occurrences of the phrase in the earlier parts of the Gospel, for there is no agreement as regards them on the part of scholars.

2. Shortly before His final journey to Jerusalem, Jesus elicited from His disciples the confession that He was the Messiah (Mark viii. 29). He accepted the confession, but warned them that Messiahship entailed suffering and death. It seems probable that He had been helped to this conclusion by a study of Isa. liii. (*cf.* also Mark xiv. 24, "which is shed *for many*," with the "many" of Isa. liii. 11, 12).

3. The idea of Sonship might seem of foremost importance, but that the precise meaning is so hard to fix. That Our Lord at Baptism received an assured conviction that He was God's beloved Son (Mark i. 11) is borne out by other passages, but what does Son imply? An orthodox theologian like Dr. McNeile will not grant any Johannine meaning in Matt. xi. 27,

"No man knoweth the Son . . ." "He knows Himself to be the champion and representative of the true Israel, the pious, humble, and oppressed . . . To Me, their Representative, the Son, the whole truth has been entrusted. None except Thee can know My Sonship, i.e. that I hold this representative office."[1]

4. The prophets were in the eyes of the Jews great and holy figures of the past. Their place had been taken by the scribes who expounded the Torah, written and unwritten, as the living guide of everyday life. But the possibility of their return was kept open. Thus in 1 Macc. xiv. 41 we read: "The Jews and the priests were well pleased that Simon should be their leader and high priest for ever, until there should arise a faithful prophet."[2] The enthusiasm with which the Hasmonæan dynasty began waned in course of time, and many must have longed for the arrival of the faithful prophet to terminate their rule. John the Baptist was held by the people to be a prophet (Matt. xiv. 5), and Jesus, who continued John's preaching of the kingdom, was also a prophet, both in popular estimation (Mark vi. 15, viii. 28), and in His own (Mark vi. 4). But, even without these passages, we should infer that He was in line with the prophets of old, from the fact that He taught "with authority" (Matt. vii. 29), from intuitive knowledge of God's will, like the prophets with their "Thus saith the Lord," and not by appeals to precedents like the scribes.

If we ask about the nature of Our Lord's prophetic consciousness, the very early tradition contained in St. Peter's speech (Acts iii. 22) gives us the answer. "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him shall ye hearken" (Deut. xviii. 15). No other passage in the Old Testament gives us so suitable a point of departure. The wording of 1 Macc. xiv. 41 implies that this prophet had not yet arisen. The contrast with Moses found in Our Lord's "But I say unto you" is a natural outcome of a conviction that He was the prophet like unto Moses, to whom the people were bidden to hearken.

[1] See *New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's*, p. 28 *f.*

[2] ἕως τοῦ ἀναστῆναι προφήτην πιστόν. The reference is apparently to Deut. xviii. 15: προφήτην ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου ὡς ἐμὲ ἀναστήσει κύριος ὁ θεός σου σοί and Num. xii. 7 (Moses): ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ μου πιστός.

5. I come now to a line of thought which is highly speculative, but, like many speculations, fascinating to some minds. Our Lord was named Joshua (Jesus). Even in our own day a child called after a religious leader by pious parents is told in early years about his great namesake. In a time when "the name" had a mysterious potency, is it conceivable that the Virgin Mary did not impress upon the Child Jesus the story of Joshua, and tell Him that He too must grow up to be a Saviour of His people? And if this idea was implanted in early childhood, would it not be enormously powerful in later life, and, unconsciously as well as consciously, influence His thoughts and words? Presently I shall try to point out examples of this influence. But first I would suggest that the mind of (Joshua) Jesus would have dwelt earnestly upon one special part of Scripture, the relations of Moses with Joshua at the close of Deuteronomy. This was for Him of crucial importance. From it He may have been led to Deut. xviii. 15 and to other passages dealing with the same period of history. The two ideas may well have coalesced in His mind—that He was the new Joshua, destined to lead His people into a promised land, the realm in which God was king; and that He was the prophet like unto Moses. Both figures were represented in the Bible as succeeding to Moses' prerogatives.

The passage I propose to study in order to illustrate this speculation is Matt. iv. 1-v. 10. I stop at this point because the last words of v. 10 "for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" repeat the conclusion of the first Beatitude, and v. 11 may be regarded as an explanatory addition in Matthew's plan. The reader is requested to notice that I give all the evidence I can find, including what weakens the case; also that at this stage I assume St. Matthew to represent accurately the mind of Jesus, even in his chronological sequence and LXX allusions.

iv. 1. *Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted* (πειρασθῆναι) *of the devil.* He is recapitulating the experience of God's people in the wilderness. They were tempted to presume upon God's patience, and passed through an experience known as Massah or "the temptation." That an allusion to this underlies our verse is suggested by the second half of the quotation in *v.* 7, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord

thy God, *as ye tempted him in Massah*" (Deut. vi. 16; LXX: ὃν τρόπον ἐξεπειράσατε ἐν τῷ Πειρασμῷ). This "day of temptation in the wilderness" is referred to in Psalm xcv., which is quoted in Heb. iii. 8-11, a context in which we find the parallel and contrast both between Moses and Christ (iii. 1-6), and between Joshua and the true Joshua (iv. 8).

2. *When he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he afterward hungered.* Matthew assimilates Our Lord's experience to that of Moses, by adding "and forty nights" and the hunger at the close of the period. See Deut. ix. 9 "I abode in the mount forty days and forty nights; I did neither eat bread nor drink water"; also Ex. xxxiv. 28.

3, 4. The first temptation is entirely founded on Deut. viii., *If thou art the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.* Israel, God's Son, was chastened and tempted in the wilderness, and fed with heavenly food. "Thou shalt consider in thine heart, that, as a man chasteneth *his son*, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee" (viii. 5). "That he might humble thee, to prove thee (ἐκπειράσῃ σε), to know what was in thine heart, whether thou wouldest keep his commandments, or no." (2). "And he humbled thee, *and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna . . .*" (3*a*). The answer to this temptation is provided by 3*b*, "that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by everything that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live."

5, 6, 7. No Deuteronomic parallel can be expected to the second temptation, or to the quotation from Psalm xci. which accompanies it. The answer is provided by the phrase from Deut. vi. 16, which we used above. Two verses later (vi. 18) occur the words "that it may be well with thee, and that thou mayest go in and possess the good land . . ." (κληρονομήσῃς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθήν), a thought which is found in Matt. v. 5, "they shall inherit the land" (κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν). We shall recur to this presently.

8-10. In the third temptation Jesus is on a high mountain and sees all the kingdoms of the world and their glory. The devil says, *All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.* Here we have a Satanic parody of Deut. xxxiv. 1-4, where Moses goes up to Mount Nebo, and God shows him

the land of Canaan, saying, " This is the land which I sware unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, saying, I will give it unto thy seed." The temptation is repelled with words from Deut. vi. 13, immediately preceding those which answered the second temptation—" Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and him shalt thou serve, and shalt swear by his name " (*κύριον τὸν θεόν σου φοβηθήσῃ, καὶ αὐτῷ λατρεύσεις, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν κολληθήσῃ*). In 18 follows the promise to inherit the good land.

11. *Then the devil leaveth him; and, behold, angels came and ministered unto him.* Deuteronomy again provides a remarkable parallel, xxxii. 43 running thus in the LXX: " Rejoice, ye heavens, with him and let the sons of God worship him: Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people and let all the angels of God strengthen him " (*εὐφράνθητε, οὐρανοί, ἅμα αὐτῷ, καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ υἱοὶ θεοῦ · εὐφράνθητε, ἔθνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνισχυσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ*).[1]

12-16. The Temptation over, Jesus returned to Galilee and settled in Capernaum. The prophecy of Isa. ix. 1 is fulfilled, *The land of Zebulun . . . Galilee of the Gentiles, the people which sat in darkness saw a great light. . . .*" In 11 we had a reference to Deut. xxxii. 43, in which verse the Gentiles are bidden rejoice with the chosen people. The connection of thought is clear. Galilee is looked on as a half Gentile centre, and the ministry of Jesus, which at the end of the Gospel is for " all the nations," is typically represented here at the beginning as for Gentiles as well as Jews. Moses, in one of the Deuteronomy passages upon which this part of Matthew is based, had invited the Gentiles to share Israel's joy.

17. Jesus begins to proclaim repentance in view of the approach of the Kingdom; see v. 3, 10 for the qualifications of citizens of the Kingdom.

[18-22. A pericope from Mark, which does not concern us.]

23-25. A summary of the preaching and healing of Jesus. The mention of Syria and Decapolis confirms the impression derived from 15 that the Gentiles are included, at least ideally, in these activities.

So far the reader will probably have found no difficulty in

[1] *Cf.* Luke xxii. 43, *ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν.*

following the argument. In attempting to trace a vein of Old Testament allusion in the Beatitudes I shall probably seem very fanciful, but the way has undoubtedly been prepared by the Old Testament basis of chapter iv. I recall the hypothesis with which I started, that Our Lord regarded Himself as a prophet like unto Moses; also as a second Joshua, raised up by God to save His people and lead them into the new promised land, the spiritual kingdom designed for them. If there is any basis of fact in this hypothesis, we shall now expect to find reminiscences of passages in Joshua as well as passages derived from Deuteronomy and perhaps other books describing the period of preparation in the wilderness.

After two introductory verses Our Lord begins the Sermon on the Mount with

v. 3. *Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.* The word "blessed" is common in the Old Testament, especially in the Psalms. A passage which may have started the train of thought is provided by Deut. xxxiii. 29, where Moses concludes his blessing of Israel by declaring: "Happy (blessed) are thou, O Israel" (*μακάριος σύ, Ἰσραήλ*). He then ascends Mount Nebo, and the Lord shows him the promised land, a passage which underlies the third temptation.

4. *Blessed are they that mourn; for they shall be comforted.* Israel mourned for Moses thirty days, and were comforted by the accession of Joshua (Deut. xxxiv.). While the sense is derived from Deut., the language bears no resemblance to that of Matthew. However, on a previous occasion the people had mourned in an act of corporate penitence; see Num. xiv. 39, "the people mourned greatly" (*ἐπένθησεν ὁ λαὸς σφόδρα, cf.* Matt. *μακάριοι οἱ πενθοῦντες*). They had just been condemned to forty years' wandering in the wilderness for their faithlessness. In the following verse they say "we have sinned," which illustrates the usual comment on Matt. v. 4, that the mourning is primarily for sin. The nearest Old Testament parallel to the verse, however, is Isa. lxi. 2, "to comfort all that mourn" (*παρακαλέσαι πάντας τοὺς πενθοῦντας*).

5. *Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the land*, not "earth" (*μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς· ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσι τὴν*

γῆν). Shortly before the Numbers passage mentioned above, in xii. 3, we read "the man Moses was very meek" (ὁ ἄνθρωπος Μωυσῆς πραὺς σφόδρα) and, in a neighbouring passage, xiv. 31, the Israelites are told that their children shall inherit the land (κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν). Neither Moses, though he was meek, nor that generation of Israelites inherited the land, but the meek to-day shall enter into the kingdom. Ps. xxxvii. 11 ("the meek shall inherit the land") is of course a closer parallel to Matt. v. 5.

6. *Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled* (μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην· ὅτι αὐτοὶ χορτασθήσονται). In Num. xi. the Israelites had hungered, lusting after the fleshpots of Egypt, and had received quails to supplement the manna. The important words of Matthew are found in Ps. cvii. 5, "hungry and thirsty (πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες), their soul fainted in them," and 9 "the hungry soul he filleth" (ἐχόρτασε ψυχὴν κενήν). The Psalm seems to refer to the return from exile, but *v.* 4 "they wandered *in the wilderness*" may have suggested *v.* 5, which would then be an echo of the earlier experiences of Israel.

7. *Blessed are the merciful; for they shall obtain mercy* (μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες· ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται). So in Josh. ii. 12 Rahab and the spies enter upon a covenant to deal mercifully with one another, "Swear unto me by the Lord, since I have dealt kindly with you, that ye also will deal kindly with my father's house" (ποιῶ ὑμῖν ἔλεος, ποιήσατε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔλεος).

8. *Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God.* The LXX of Deut. xxxii. 43, a verse we have already quoted in connection with Matt. iv. 11, concludes thus: "The Lord will make the land of his people pure" (ἐκκαθαριεῖ Κύριος τὴν γῆν τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ).

9. *Blessed are the peacemakers* (οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί); *for they shall be called sons of God.* There was one exception to the ruthless severity of the Hebrew invaders, when "Joshua made peace with them (i.e. the Gibeonites—ἐποίησεν Ἰησοῦς πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰρήνην), and made a covenant with them to let them live" (Josh. ix. 15).

10. I have nothing to suggest for this verse.

Who is responsible for such Old Testament allusions as we have discovered? They differ completely in character from the formal fulfilments of prophecy found in the special matter of the First Gospel. The Temptation narrative and the Beatitudes, pretty much as they stand in Matthew, are recognized as going back to Q. In so far as the reminiscences depend on details of the Greek version which are not found in the Hebrew, we must assign their origin to the period when translations of the Logia were being made into Greek and "each one interpreted them as he could," no doubt with the help of much reflection on the hidden meaning of the Scriptures.[1] But something remains which must have been in the original Aramaic reports of Our Lord's words. The Temptation narrative is generally considered to go back to Jesus Himself, who in this symbolic form told the disciples about His inner struggles. Sufficient has been said above to make it probable that the struggle turned not so much upon the conduct of the Messiah, in the generally accepted sense of the term, as upon that of the prophet like unto Moses. I do not think it too bold a speculation to suggest that Jesus took with Him into the wilderness, for spiritual reading during the "retreat," a roll of the Law containing Deuteronomy.[2] As regards the Beatitudes, I do not think there is more than unconscious reminiscence, due to years of meditation from the dawn of reflection, of passages connected with His great namesake Joshua. No such cause is likely to have operated upon the minds of the early Christians—the reminiscences are too subtle. We have, then, reason for thinking that in Matthew's version of the Beatitudes we have, practically, the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus.[3]

[1] Perhaps we should allow for the possibility of the Greek version's having influenced the interpretation of the Hebrew text, and even for the current Hebrew text's having been nearer the LXX than our printed text is.

[2] *Cf.* Luke iv. 17 *ff.*, where He reads the Hebrew and then expounds the passage in the vernacular.

[3] The late Dr. E. C. Selwyn in *The Oracles in the New Testament* follows a line of thought similar to that found in this article. The book is not judicial, and is in my opinion largely wrong, but its subtlety and originality give it great value. It is one of those books

Two references from Josephus show that the Messiah could be looked upon as a Joshua *redivivus*.

(*a*) *Ant.* XX. v. 1. "Theudas persuaded a great part of the people to take their effects with them and follow him to the river Jordan; for he told them he was a prophet, and that he would, by his own command, divide the river, and afford them an easy passage over it." *Cf.* Josh. iii.; Acts v. 36.

(*b*) *Ant.* XX. viii. 6. The prophet from Egypt "advised the multitude of the common people to go along with him to the Mount of Olives. . . . He would show them from thence how at his command the walls of Jerusalem would fall down." *Cf.* Josh. vi.; Acts xxi. 38.

---

from whose very mistakes, inseparable from a pioneer work, one learns more than from others' repetition of correct opinions.

Justin Martyr, who as a Palestinian belonged to the same circle (at a late date) as those for whom the First Gospel was written, would not have thought this argument fanciful. See his *Dialogue with Trypho*, cxiii., where he lays great stress on the son of Nun's name having been changed to Jesus. He alone of his contemporaries entered the Promised Land. As Jesus the Son of Nun distributed the good land to those who entered, so Jesus the Christ will distribute the spiritual land to His people. Joshua-ben-nun in Aramaic and New Hebrew = Joshua son of fish, i.e., in Semitic idiom, the Fish. Is not the title of Fish for our Lord, as in early Christian Art, evidence for the identification of Jesus with Joshua? The literary explanation, that it is derived from the first letters of Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτήρ, is an obvious afterthought.

V

JESUS AND THE PHARISEES

I

THE traditional view of the Pharisees is too familiar to need description. In Sunday School lesson books they are the type of false religion. We turn to Webster's Dictionary and read: "*pharisaism*: Rigid observance of external forms of religion, without genuine piety"; or "*pharisee*: A self-righteous or hypocritical person. See MUGWUMP." So it is with a sense of shock that the Christian student comes up against the modern view of the Pharisees presented in G. F. Moore's great book on *Judaism*, C. G. Montefiore's *The Synoptic Gospels* (second edition, 1927), I. Abrahams' two volumes of *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, or R. T. Herford's second book on the subject, *The Pharisees*. Jewish writers may be expected to show partisanship on behalf of a class so much attacked in Christian books. Perhaps Mr. Herford is in a position to attain serene impartiality. Anyhow, let us see what manner of men the Pharisees are in his pages.

Mr. Herford starts from Ezra, in whom two main ideas are seen: the setting-up of a barrier between Jew and Gentile, and the revelation of the divine will in the Torah (Torah is used throughout the book without being translated. Its real meaning is "teaching." The Torah of Moses means the teaching given through Moses and contained in the Pentateuch. But Torah has a continuous existence, and as time goes on the unwritten Torah gains at the expense of the written. The LXX wrongly translated the word by *νόμος* and St. Paul, "who ought to have known better," p. 54, perpetuated the error.) The second of these ideas necessitated the existence of interpreters. These were called Sopherim (scribes)—that is, "men of the book." The original scribes, or the Great Synagogue, died out about 270 B.C., after which follow

100 years blank. About 196 the Sanhedrin was formed, the name of which proves Greek influence. Among those who contended for Judaism in the Maccabæan Wars we must distinguish a moderate party and an extreme party, the Hasidim, whose interest was religious, and who resented the mingling of politics and religion under the Hasmonæan dynasty. The difference between the two sections, which afterwards developed into the Sadducees and Pharisees, lay in their respective attitude to the Oral Tradition in its application to the Torah; all other differences are of secondary importance. The political leaders took their stand on the text of the written Torah as against " an interpretation of the Torah whereby its authority could be extended indefinitely " (p. 29). The actual split took place in the reign of John Hyrcanus (135-105 B.C.). An association of " haberim " (companions) was formed, men pledged to observe the laws of tithe and of clean and unclean. They were in four grades, all alike marked off from " the people of the land." The first and largest order, through which all had to pass, was called Pherushim. This was the origin of the name. The Pharisees were about 6,000 in number according to Josephus, but their influence penetrated far beyond their own ranks. If they represented the old Hasidim, the Sadducees were not the Hellenists, for they were as eager for levitical purity as the Pharisees, differing from them only as regards the unwritten Torah. The Pharisees were not a party in the ordinary sense, but were non-political. Their whole concern was religious, whereas the Sadducees were a party, not indifferent to religion, but primarily political. "It was the trial of strength between the purely religious and the political theory of Jewish national life " (p. 45). As to the other parties, the Herodians were probably not Jews at all for the most part. The Essenes and the Zealots were two wings of the Pharisees, produced by the oppressions of Herod. The Essenes solved the problem of living under the Torah by withdrawal from the world; the Zealots agreed with the Pharisees in their devotion to the Torah, but were no longer satisfied with peaceful methods. The result of the great split sometime before 105 B.C. was that there was no more unity in Judaism, not even in the years leading to 70 A.D.

" When the storm died away, the Pharisees alone survived " (p. 52).

The essence of Pharisaism, therefore, is its insistence on a living revelation. Psalm cxix is a great hymn of praise to Torah—not the Pentateuch, but the living guide based on the written books which declared God's will. This psalm breathes the spirit of Pharisaism. The teaching of the Rabbis was either Halachah or Haggadah. " A halachah . . . was a specific declaration of the divine will applicable to a given case." It was defined by the supreme religious legislative authority; it was based on careful study, and defined by a majority. Once promulgated it was irreversible save by a majority vote of a Council which exceeded the former in wisdom and number. The Greeks, noticing only that side of Halachah which bore fruit in regulations for Community life, translated it by *νόμος* (" law "), an error which to this day obscures the true meaning of Pharisaism. Haggadah is the interpretation of Scripture with a view to edification. Broadly speaking, Halachah and Haggadah correspond to Christian moral and doctrinal theology. But the emphasis is completely different. In Pharisaism Haggadah is free, Halachah enforced; in Christianity great freedom of conduct is allowed, but Creeds are enforced. The bond of union afforded by Halachah in Judaism, Christianity finds in dogma, worked out in far more detail than anything in Rabbinism.

Christian opinion has never treated the Pharisees fairly. It has contrasted them unfavourably with the prophets, not noticing that Ezra and his successors did what the prophets failed to do—namely, enforce moral and religious teaching on the lives of the people. The Synagogue is praised by Christian writers, and is indeed recognized as having been the model for the primitive Christian communities, but it was the centre of Pharisaic influence. The later Christian critics have been *ex hypothesi* non-Jews, the earliest were Jews who broke with Pharisaism and Halachah in favour of freedom, and are therefore not trustworthy witnesses. Current statements are mostly misstatements. The Rabbis have always been keenly alive to the danger of hypocrisy. The external authority of the Torah is to the Jew the authority of God; no

opposition has ever been felt between conscience and Halachah. The doctrine of merit is quite consistent with humility. "Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord" is exactly what the Pharisee meant by his doctrine of reward. The Rabbis insisted more on the nearness of God than on His transcendence. If they taught that all men were children of God, but sonship was effectually realized only in Israel, the Church has taught a precisely similar doctrine.

Mr. Herford's treatment of our Lord and St. Paul makes painful reading. The Pharisees did not understand Jesus; no one like Him had ever appeared before, and they were taken by surprise. Nor did He understand them, such were His limitations. "That he had any far-reaching views upon any subject of thought whatever . . . does not, so far as I can see, anywhere appear" (p. 203). As regards Halachah, "he would be an outsider, with no means of forming a correct judgment upon what he saw, at the mercy of rumour" (p. 207). He made no attempt to understand the Pharisees, nor did they try to understand Him. Matt. xxiii. (generally taken to be a sharpening of our Lord's teaching in view of current controversies in the Palestinian Church) may well be the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, "because it is quite intelligible that a man, driven to bay by his opponents, should turn and rend them" (p. 209).

As to St. Paul, "all that Paul said about the burden of the Law, and of man being sold under bondage under sin, was presumably true of himself; but it did not correspond to anything in the experience of the Pharisees" (p. 165). Paul's attack on Judaism is misrepresentation. Had Judaism been what he describes, it would have been extinct long ago. Mr. Herford styles the apostle's treatment of the Jews "a shameful story" (p. 224). Judaism since 70 A.D. is essentially Pharisaism. It and Christianity are two great religions. When Christianity has finished its task, then Judaism will step forward and offer the world its imperishable treasure, preserved through the ages.

This is being more of a Jew than the Jews themselves. Dr. Montefiore is much gentler. True, he describes Matt. xxiii. as "the most 'un-Christian' chapter in the Gospels" (*The Synoptic Gospels*, ii. 296), but he quotes with approval a

dictum that these are " fighting speeches " not to be taken too seriously. Dr. Abrahams, too, as one would expect, reveals on every page of his two books of *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* learning, delicacy of touch, suspense of judgment where suspense is necessary, and spiritual perception. G. F. Moore, for his part, is only incidentally concerned with the Christian statements about the Pharisees. As befits one who is expounding Judaism as a closed system he is uniformly sympathetic to it; the comparison of Judaism with Christianity does not enter into his scheme.

It is clear that so one-sided a book as Mr. Herford's can easily be answered. The fallacy is this. The sources on which he relies are almost entirely later than 70 A.D. Now the Church-Judaism, as it may be called, dominated by a purified Pharisaism, which prevailed after the fall of Jerusalem, was clearly a very different thing from the Jewish State prior to 70, with its many parties and fanatical hatreds. The general impression gained by reading Josephus corroborates the Gospel picture of Judaism rather than Mr. Herford's. But Mr. Herford's method is to rule out the New Testament writers as partisan witnesses. Much later writers are relied on as evidence of what Judaism was like before the cataclysm. If the Judaism which confronted our Lord and His apostles was that described in Mr. Herford's book, then the New Testament writers cannot be acquitted of serious misrepresentation of the facts. But no historian can possibly accept his methods of weighing evidence. That no renegade Jew's word can be accepted is apparently his canon. Just think how far this takes us. Luther's evidence regarding German Catholicism in the early sixteenth century must be ruled out on this principle. The picture of Philip Gosse and a Victorian Puritan household drawn in *Father and Son* is valueless because the son came out of bondage. J. H. Newman's description of Anglicanism in the *Apologia* is not evidence; and so on. Christian evidence having been ruled out, we fall back upon the Pharisees' opinion of themselves ! Two quotations from Dr. Abrahams' second volume will show the direction in which Mr. Herford's book may be answered. On p. 10 we read, " All this would strengthen the view that the Gospel attack is directed (here and elsewhere)

not on Pharisaism, but against certain Pharisees "—a solution so obvious that one might shrink from adopting it without the approval of Dr. Abrahams. And on p. 12 certain contingencies are discussed. " If that be so, then we can perceive how ill-conceived is the method of the Schürer School, who convert the Gospel attack on the School of Shammai into a condemnation of Pharisaism, which, as a system, emerges historically with the school of Hillel triumphant." This sentence alone seems to destroy much of Mr. Herford's case. I have noticed a casual allusion to Shammai in his book, but the name does not occur in the index. Clearly, then, there are many possibilities not discussed.

II

Nevertheless, a candid student is not content when he has " answered " someone with whom he disagrees. In the present case a very important fact emerges. Certain scholars of the highest eminence are agreed that the New Testament gives an inaccurate picture of the Pharisees; that the Jewish sources do not support the theory that there was a radical divergence between the State-Judaism prior to the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 and the Church-Judaism of the following period; and that, though the sharpening of polemic is clear in the later books of the New Testament, enough remains in the earlier documents to show that the misconception goes back to Jesus Himself. Can we accept this new reading of the Gospel story and remain Christians in the traditional sense ?

It is a grave issue. Christian apologists are still inclined to argue as if the perfection of Our Lord's humanity is common ground, or to confute Nietzsche, whose views now seem definitely pre-War. Fr. Thornton's magnificent philosophical and cosmical argument in *The Incarnate Lord* carries the reader along its various stages with conviction and growing enthusiasm —until the actual Incarnation is reached. But at this point he begins to assume rather than to prove. Two-thirds of humanity still decline to accept Jesus as the pattern of perfect manhood, and the success of missionary propaganda is a link in the chain of argument as yet unsupplied. But will it ever

be supplied if expert opinion in the West comes to accept the view of Jewish scholars that Jesus failed to live up to His own Sermon on the Mount in dealing with His enemies the Pharisees, and even perhaps to share their conviction that of the two, Hillel and Jesus, the well-balanced character of Hillel is to be preferred to the impulsive one of Jesus? If I put forward tentative suggestions it is with considerable diffidence and because I feel the attack should not be left unanswered.

It is commonly said on the Jewish side that the Christian tradition found in St. Matthew is an exaggeration of the primitive Gospel tradition found in St. Mark, which itself exaggerates the teaching of Jesus, who in His turn ignored the good side of the Pharisees and exaggerated their bad side.[1] Ignoring the supposed development, which in a measure is often conceded by Christian scholars, let us assume that Jesus uttered sayings like Mark vii. 8: "Ye leave the commandment of God, and hold fast the tradition of men"; Matt. vi. 5: "When ye pray, be not as the hypocrites (*i.e.*, Pharisees)"; or Matt. xxiii.: "The Pharisees . . . say, and do not," "ye shut the kingdom of heaven against men," "ye . . . have left undone the weightier matters of the law, judgment, and mercy, and faith" (verses 3, 13, 23). Let us assume also that the verdict is too one-sided to be the whole truth about a complicated problem. Can we still maintain the perfect goodness of Christ?

It is possible to enlarge our conception of the necessary ignorance involved in the Incarnation and to say simply that, just as Our Lord did not know the hour of the Parousia, so He did not understand the Pharisees fully. Professor L. Hodgson, in his most suggestive *And Was Made Man*, develops this thought. There are two types of ignorance, culpable and non-culpable. God Incarnate in Christ was necessarily subject to the latter. He proceeds to a deep and

[1] For an extreme example of the *formgeschichtlich* method see Riddle's *Jesus and the Pharisees*. This scholar holds that the stories of Our Lord's controversies with the Jews arose out of the needs of the early Church. They are a reading back into the period of the Ministry of the conclusions to which the Christians, influenced by St. Paul, came in their controversies with the Jews. The Gospels, that is, in this respect reflect the reaction of the ex-Pharisee against his former views.

beautiful thought. We can help our fellow-men only by believing in them. But we must believe in them with utter honesty, not with make-believe. Jesus believed in men utterly. Perhaps by a deliberate kenosis, involved in the Incarnation itself, He became ignorant of the darker side of human nature. This explains His faith in men—also His disappointment when they showed themselves unworthy of His trust.[1]

I feel a difficulty in thus equating ignorance of the date of the Parousia with ignorance of the best side of the religious leaders with whom Jesus was brought into conflict, and prefer to approach the problem from a completely different standpoint.

If we believe in the Incarnation we hold that the Son of God took flesh at the culmination of a certain line of development, which can only be the prophetic strain in Judaism—certainly it was not the hieratic or legal strain. The spiritual kinship is marked between Jeremiah and the Second Isaiah on the one hand and Jesus on the other. Again, if Jesus was not the fulfilment of the priestly side of Judaism, still less was He a Greek philosopher or an Eastern sage. His attitude towards life was, then, the prophetic one. This carries with it certain limitations. The perfectly poised philosopher might have attained to a full comprehension of Pharisaism in all its strength and weakness *and would have achieved nothing*. The prophet, the reformer, by the necessity of his being sees one side of a problem at a time. It may be the most important side, but it can rarely be the whole of the problem that he sees. So it was with Our Lord. He saw vividly the unlovely side of Pharisaism, those qualities in it that were cramping men's religion, and attacked them vigorously. At times He seems to have dwelt on the gracious side of the Law and He certainly was not a rebel for rebellion's sake. He, in virtue of His Incarnation, was subject to the human law of rhythm, especially marked in prophetic souls, by which He saw one thing at a time. It hardly needs to be said that only in this way are ancient abuses ever brought to an end.[2]

[1] Pp. 44-47.

[2] May we not add that perfectly balanced philosophic poise is a mark of old age, and not generally found in a young man of thirty?

But was Pharisaism an abuse? Jewish scholars aver that it has been radically misconceived. The endless precepts, which at first sight seem so formidable, for the most part only forbade what no one wanted to do. Many of them again were counsels of perfection for the devout and not imposed on the masses. The Torah as a whole was a delight to the Jew.

We may grant all this, but the obstinate fact remains that the restrictions which were necessary to safeguard the existence of the little post-exilic Judæan community had hardened to an intolerable extent. The Jew in denying it forgets that Judaism had a treasure for the world's benefit which should not have been hoarded. It *was* an abuse and a tragedy that the universal message of the Second Isaiah was reserved for those who accepted such ordinances as circumcision. Judaism was potentially a world religion: it chose to remain a nationalist cult. True, Pharisaism sought proselytes, but only on condition that they became full Jews.

Humanly speaking, Pharisaic Judaism held an almost impregnable position, which could be stormed only by a supreme genius. There, from the purely historical standpoint, lies the greatness of Jesus. His personality was so mighty that it shattered Judaism into two. The universal religion that Judaism already was potentially became an actual fact. Christianity faced and overcame the difficulty which had prevented Judaism from becoming supra-national, that of common meals of Jew and Gentile.[1] But how could this shattering of Judaism have taken place at all unless Jesus had *destroyed* much of what confronted Him? And would He have destroyed it unless He had been so vividly conscious of the abuses of Pharisaism, that sometimes its better side was hidden from Him?

The conflict between Judaism and Christianity has been admirably defined by a recent writer.[2] In the Old Testament two religions are combined. The Talmud and the Gospel are both based on the Old Testament. But they part company in their attitude towards the cultus, ceremonial, and tradition.

[1] Had there been only worship of the synagogue type, fusion of Jew and Gentile could have been avoided. The existence of the Eucharist forced the issue. Indeed, the Eucharist was the one power strong enough to create a world religion.

[2] M. Dibelius, *Z.N.T.W.*, 1928, pp. 188-9.

The Talmud takes the nationalist, Christianity the universalist, element; the Talmud conserves the whole Torah, Christianity picks out the ethical, prophetic, and specially religious part.[1]

Jewish writers hardly appreciate the extent to which their racial traditions are influencing the world through Christianity. The nations of Northern Europe have forgotten their patriarchs, substituting those of the Hebrews. Abraham, Isaac, Joseph, Moses and Samuel are our nursery heroes. With the missionary mass-movements of our day they are going forward to ever new triumphs in Africa. In the last resort all this may be traced to the attack delivered by Jesus upon Pharisaism.

III

That the conquered race, provided it is not extirpated, conquers its invaders is a truism. Even in England, where, according to theory, the Anglo-Saxon invaders practically destroyed the British, we see the law at work. What proportion of Nordic blondes are left in a big English city? The Christian Church was not exempt from the law. St. Paul, who was the first to realize the implications of Our Lord's attitude to Pharisaism and to whom the final break with the Synagogue is to be ascribed, was very little understood in the centuries following his death. Much that he withstood came back again as the Gentile Church studied the Old Testament which it had inherited.

Let us listen to G. F. Moore on the nature of Judaism. One had to be a full member or entirely outside; there was no half-way house. Judaism was radically different from philosophy. It was "a religion of authority; a revealed religion, which did not ask man's approval but demanded obedience to the whole and every part . . . an exclusive religion which tolerated no divided allegiance." The proselyte —there were no proselytes save those who by circumcision and baptism became full members of the Jewish nation—had to accept the unwritten as well as the written law. "A contemporary of the Patriarch Judah held that the proselyte's

[1] But see below for a limitation to be put on this.

acceptance of Judaism was incomplete and his admission not to be allowed so long as he made reservation of a single point in the rules established by the scribes without obvious support in Scripture."[1] Alter a few details, and the description would fit Roman Catholicism. In view of the great importance of Rome as a Jewish centre in the imperial period, we cannot rule out the possibility of imitation, conscious or unconscious, of Judaism by the Roman Church.[2] And, in that case, was not a revival of Paulinism, accompanied by a split of Christianity into two parts, in a measure analogous to the first-century split of Judaism, in the long run inevitable ?

[1] *Judaism*, i. 323-331.

[2] See *Harvard Theological Review* (1927), pp. 183-403, G. La Piana's Essay on " Foreign Groups in Rome during the First Centuries of the Empire."

VI

THE "EXCEPTING CLAUSE" IN ST. MATTHEW

WITH some hesitation I join in the discussion of the famous exception in Matt. v. 32, xix. 9. The proposed solution of the problem is so simple and can be stated so shortly that I venture to put it forward, though I realize that simplicity is generally attained in such matters by neglecting important elements of the problem.

Disregarding the Hebrew which lies behind the phrase, let us ask what παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας, "except for cause of ——," would have meant in the period A.D. 60-80 in the Church of Antioch, which may well have been the place of origin of the First Gospel. πορνεία cannot have meant infidelity within the realm of marriage, for in Matt. xv. 19 it is distinguished from μοιχεία. For St. Matthew infidelity between betrothal and marriage would have been adultery (μοιχεία), see i. 19. Unchaste conduct on the part of a maiden before her betrothal at 14 or 15 is very unlikely. We must look therefore for some other form of sexual impropriety.

Two passages throw light on the word. In 1 Cor. v. 1 St. Paul denounces a heinous form of πορνεία, a man's marrying his father's widow. (The link between the woman and the father may have been slight in Christian eyes, perhaps an irregular secondary union, and the "liberty"-loving Corinthian Christians thought it could be disregarded "in the Lord.")

The Apostolic Decree of Acts xv. 29 promulgated a compromise by which Gentiles and Jews could share a common social life, and with it the Eucharist: the Jews were not to demand circumcision or the ceremonial law; the Gentiles were to abstain from meat sold at the butcher's which had played its part at a sacrifice, from meat at the killing of which the blood had not been properly drained, from "black-puddings" and other repellent ways of using the blood, and from "fornica-

tion" (πορνείας). The "Western Text" and interpretation, by which the Gentiles are to abstain from idolatry, murder and fornication, are surely inconceivable—the discussion was on a higher level than that. But they naturally arose, with the dropping out of "things strangled," when the Church had outgrown a purely local and temporary compromise, forgetting even that it had ever existed. Notice that the decree was read with joy at Antioch (xv. 31); it was taken to the Churches of the First Journey (xvi. 4). It seems to have reached the Province of Asia (Rev. ii. 14). In Corinth St. Paul felt at liberty to urge its food regulations on the ground of charity only (1 Cor. viii). Since the first three articles of the compromise are concerned with practices which were abhorrent to the Jews but seemed innocent enough to the Gentiles, the fourth must be of a similar nature. The passage in 1 Corinthians gives us the clue. πορνεία here means *marriage within the prohibited Levitical degrees*. In this matter Gentile Christianity wholly adopted Jewish standards, and the decree became obsolete because there was no longer any difference of opinion. But for a decade or two, especially in places like Antioch, where Jew and Gentile met and where the agitation which led to the decree arose, *marriage within the prohibited degrees* was a live issue, and πορνεία was the word by which it was known.

Turning to St. Matthew, the problem we have to account for is the obscuring of the plain rule of St. Mark by an exception which seems inconsistent with the teaching of Our Lord even in St. Matthew. If the foregoing argument holds, the reference is to the local Syrian problem. One exception is allowed to the universal rule: when a man who has married within the prohibited degrees puts away his wife the word adultery is out of place. Rather the marriage is null. The tradition represented in the First Gospel rightly puts the exception on Our Lord's lips. He was dealing with Jewish conditions—the development of His teaching to fit Gentile problems was a legitimate extension of it.

If this solution is correct, the famous excepting clause, so far from being a flaw in the Church's case, strengthens it. There is no divorce, but causes of nullity may be recognized.

Note by F. Gavin

[By the courtesy of Dr. Gavin, of New York, I am allowed to reproduce his note which he wrote for me in response to my request for Rabbinical evidence. It appeared in *Theology*, February, 1928.]

Certain considerations drawn from the Rabbinic evidence would seem to favour the above contention. An examination of the meaning of the word in the New Testament (the abstract noun *πορνεία*, the nouns *πορνός* and *πορνή*, and the verb *πορνεύω*), leaving to one side the Matthæan texts and Acts xv., would seem to indicate the following: (1) The term frequently appears in lists of vices and sins—as, *e.g.*, in 1 Cor. v. 9-11, vi. 9; Gal. v. 19; Col. iii. 5; 1 Tim. i. 10, *cf.* also Rom. i. 29; the brief summaries in 2 Cor. xii. 21; Eph. v. (3), 5; and Rev. ix. 21; xxi. 8; xxii. 15. On these Lietzmann, *Handbuch zum N.T.*, iii., 11; Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten* (Tübingen, 1908), pp. 230-231, and Dieterich, *Nekyia* (Leipzig, 1913), pp. 174 *ff.*, have shed much light. These lists are apparently common to Stoic moralists, but certain of them (as, *e.g.*, those in 1 Corinthians) have a strongly Jewish character. From the presence of the abstract noun *πορνεία*, or the masculine *πορνός*, in such lists, little can be deduced as to the specific idea underlying the term, save that it refers to some form of illicit sexual relationship which is neither adultery, sodomy, nor bestiality. " Fornication " may be used for it.

(2) The feminine noun *πορνή*, in the sense of *harlot*, is applied to Rahab in James ii. 25 and Hebrews xi. 31. In Revelation it is frequently (xvii. 1, 5, 15, 16; xix. 2) applied figuratively to " Babylon," and the term, as a verb as well as in the abstract nounal form, is also used figuratively (*e.g.*, ii. 14, 20, 21; ix. 21; xiv. 8; xvii. 2, 4; xviii. 3; xix. 2).

(3) Certain other passages would seem definitely to bear the sense " prostitute " (-ion), " fornication " (-or)—*e.g.*, Matt. xxi. 32; Luke xv. 30, in the story of the Prodigal Son; 1 Cor. v. 9; vi. 13, 15, 18; vii. 2; Heb. xiii. 4; as well as some of the instances noted in (1) above.

(4) 1 Cor. v. 1 *ff.* specifically refers to a case of " incest "—a marital relationship contracted between parties related in the

forbidden degrees. Possibly also John viii. 41 bears this meaning, and this restriction may be also in mind in other passages. The former meaning—illicit sexual intercourse by unmarried people—is then not the only specific use of the term, for the union condemned in 1 Cor. v. 1 is evidently an incestuous one.

A special technical term for this particular sexual irregularity does not seem to have been current in the Greek of earlier than the Byzantine period. In classical times "incest" is expressed euphemistically or periphrastically. By the sixth century of the Christian era the term *αἰμομιξία* became current, as in Gregentius, *circa* 540 (in Migne, *P.G.*, lxxxvi. 584), and John the Faster, *circa* 593 (*ibid.*, lxxxviii. 1921); and from Photius († 891; Migne, *ibid.*, ci. 3; 281) on, it is frequently met with. In Philo, where one might expect the use of a technical term covering cases of incest forbidden by the Mosaic Law or the Halakha, the word *πορνεία* and derivatives seem to have been avoided; the Law is explained by the use of other non-technical terms. Particularly germane is section three in *de specialibus legibus* (*cf.* Cohn and Wendland, v. [Berlin 1906], 153 *ff.*), where one might naturally look for the use of a specific term covering cases of incest or marriage within the forbidden degrees. Unfortunately the concordance of Philonic words in the seventh volume has not yet come to the letter *π*, nor have the new lexicons of papyrological usage arrived so far; so fuller data from both Philo and the papyri are not yet conveniently accessible. The use of the term *πορνεία* in the Apostolic Fathers and Apologists—*e.g.*, Justin in his *Dialogue*—is not decisive, save that the word seems to be understood solely in the sense of fornication, prostitution, etc. If this negative result may be taken to indicate the meaning of the word in non-Jewish circles, we are given some indication why Philo, the Jewish apologist, used circumlocutions and would not, if he knew it as a Jew, specifically describe incest under the term *πορνεία*.

Rabbinic Hebrew did have a special term for marriage within the forbidden degrees—'*ervah*—which was also used to denominate women thus forbidden in marriage. (There are cases of the use of the transliteration of the Greek word *πορνή* in the sense of "prostitute," but none that I have been

able to discover, where it would seem to be used for *'ervah*, nor does the feminine abstract noun πορνεία appear in the earlier Rabbinic literature.) The peculiar thing about the Hebrew term *'ervah* (which comes from Deut. xxiv. 1) is that it includes *both* of the meanings we have seen attached to the word πορνεία in New Testament usage—viz., the meaning "fornication," as in Pirke Aboth, iii., 13; Keth., 13*b*; Gittin, 90*a*, etc.; and the specific idea of "incest," or women with whom marriage is precluded by reason of cognate or consanguineous relationship, as in Yeb. 2 and 3 *passim*, Yeb., 21*a*, Gittin, 64*a*, etc. Rabbinism was naturally preoccupied with the interpretation of the Biblical forbidden degrees, and derived or constructed a second and third wall of defence about the biblical injunctions (*cf. s.v.* "Incest" in *J.E.*). As questions of legitimacy affected inheritance, and thus the laws of property, both for Jews born and for converts to Judaism, the intricacies of all the questions relating to marriage within the forbidden degrees are fully explored in the Talmud. In relation to converts to Judaism many questions in regard to the laws of *'ervah* are discussed: What are the degrees forbidden to a non-Jew who is bound only to the observance of the "Noachic" Laws? In case of the conversion to Judaism of a Gentile already married, does his marriage stand? Is it dissolvable at will? Is its status affected retroactively by the limitations, hitherto irrelevant to him, of the law incumbent upon Jews as to forbidden degrees? Are children born to him before his conversion legitimatized by the act of their father's conversion? How far does the principle that a "convert is like a child newly born" affect the case? How greatly such cases and difficulties affected early Christianity it would be interesting to know. The Pauline legislation—or, rather, opinions—recorded in 1 Cor. vii. 8 *ff.*, sustains its best interpretation in the light of Jewish procedure.

Of the two meanings of the Hebrew term *'ervah*, the second, *incest*, is definitely precluded in the discussion between Shammaites and Hillelites in Mishna Gittin ix. 10, and the baraithas (Babylonian Talmud, 90*a* [*cf.* Sifre to Deut. xxiv. 1, § 269], and Yer. ix. 11, Ed. Krot., p. 108). Yet this discussion forms an interesting and instructive background for Matt. v. 32.

It derives from the verse Deut. xxiv. 1: " When a man taketh a wife and marrieth her, then it shall be, if she find no favour in his eyes because he hath found *some unseemly thing* in her, that he shall write her a bill of divorcement. . . ." The italicized words are *'ervath dabbar*—literally, "a shame of a thing"= a shameful thing. The only other appearance of the words (Deut. xxiii. 14) does not assist in the interpretation here needed. The LXX (ὅτι εὗρεν ἐν αὐτῇ ἄσχημον πρᾶγμα) is in line with the Targums of Onkelos and Jer. (*'abrath pithgam*= a transgression of a commandment), and the earlier traditional interpretation—as in Josephus, *Antiq.* iv. 8, 23, § 253, and Philo, *de special. legg.*, iii., 5, § 30—is that laxer view of the grounds of divorce urged by the Hillelites in the Mishna and baraitha above. The debate there recorded hinges on the meaning of the words " unseemly thing ": the Bet Hillel argued, " unchastity *or* some other thing "; the Bet Shammai, " *matter of* unchastity." The last three words of the question put in Matt. xix. 3, εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀπολῦσαι τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν, are precisely the sort of resultant summary deducible from the sundry adequate grounds for divorce, according to the mind of the Hillelites, as may be seen from the list made accessible by Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N.T.* i. 316-318. As Moore (*Judaism* ii., p. 124, note 4) points out, the words παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας (variant in Matt. xix. 9; text in v. 32) represent exactly the formulation of the Shammaites, who transposed the two words *'ervath dabbar* to *debar 'ervah*, as in the Mishna (ix. 10).[1] The same Mishna in the Talmud Yer. (here enumerated ix. 11) omits the word *dabar* entirely, as also the Cambridge Codex. So the dominical words recorded in St. Matthew have rival Rabbinical opinions as their immediate occasion, and in the form here given are emphatically in the direction of the Bet Shammai, the rigorist, as against the Bet Hillel, the laxist, view. But what specific meaning is then to be attached to the exception λόγου πορνείας? It may mean (*a*) the limited, (=Shammaite) view of the one valid ground for divorce, derived from Deut. xxiv. 1; or (*b*) is it possible that it is a gloss,

[1] In the Munich MS. 95, by attraction from the text Deut. xxiv. 1, the order of the words is thereto assimilated—a not uncommon practice of the scribe.

of a Judaic type, which has crept into the text, meaning, to the glossator's mind, the obvious preclusion of the maintenance of a marital relationship if the woman shall have been discovered to be, in the second Rabbinic sense, one forbidden by reason of the incestuous degrees of Lev. xviii. 6-18? The dissolution of the relationship with such a one would not be "divorce" at all, and no hindrance would exist preventing a valid marriage to either party.

In Acts xv. 20, 29 *πορνεία* seems only to mean incest—in the second Rabbinic sense noted above. "Here it may not mean 'fornication' or 'unchastity' in general, since *πορνεία* in this meaning would surely be forbidden to everyone, hence it could not be taken as a special prohibition incumbent upon Gentile converts to Christianity. It must, however, be taken to mean 'marriage within the degrees forbidden' by Lev. xviii. 6-18" (Strack-Billerbeck, ii. 729, where the Rabbinic second line of defence against transgression of the Law of the Torah is expounded). This passage would seem to be outstandingly important in assisting us to control the meaning of *πορνεία* in the New Testament. The authoritative edition of the text by Ropes (Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part I., *The Acts of the Apostles*, vol. iii., *The Text of Acts*, London, 1926), pp. 144-149, gives the important variants, and discusses the problem of the "three-clause" as against the "four-clause" reading on pp. 265-269. In either case, the contention that "abstention from *porneia*" would mean adoption by non-Jewish Christians of the Levitical law of incest, seems clearly to be demanded adequately to account for the word in its context. The tenor of the debate *passim* (especially the use of the word *παρενοχλεῖν*) would indicate that the Council would not mean to include the cases of incestuous relationship of the Rabbinic enactments (=*issur mitzvah*), but only those termed *issur 'ervah*, the cases covered by the explicit specifications of biblical Law.

Since, then, Acts quite definitely, St. Paul in 1 Cor. v. certainly, and the glossed text represented in the First Gospel probably, have in view specific Rabbinic usage, the interpretation of the alleged Matthæan exception contains on substantial departure on the point of Dominical marriage legislation from the Synoptic tradition as stated in Mark x. 2 *ff.* and Luke xvi. 18.

VII

A NOTE ON THE PROTO-LUKE HYPOTHESIS[1]

A GRADUAL change has been coming over the views held by scholars as regards St. Luke's use of sources; more and more the importance of his special source has emerged. Professor Burkitt in *The Gospel History and its Transmission* (1906) maintained that Q, the main non-Markan source, contained a Passion-Narrative, which is found in Luke and is better than Mark's version. Dr. Bartlet in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem* (1911) argued that St. Luke's second source (Mark being the first) was a document in which the matter peculiar to Luke had been fused with the Sayings of Q. Dr. Stanton in *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Vol. II. (1909), reached a similar conclusion. Canon Streeter in his article in *The Hibbert Journal* of Oct., 1921, propounded his famous theory of Proto-Luke, a document written at Cæsarea about 60 A.D., which was afterwards expanded into the Third Gospel. In *The Four Gospels* (1924) he slightly modified his position. St. Luke, he thinks, made notes at Cæsarea, afterwards working them up into a complete document with the help of a copy of Q; still later with the help of Mark he wrote the complete Gospel, inserting extracts from Mark into his already existing framework. This is the gist of the theory: Mark was for St Luke only a secondary authority. "Proto-Luke was, and was originally intended as, a complete Gospel"—if only for private circulation (p. 221).

Dr. Taylor has written a big book in which he works out Canon Streeter's theory, which after all had only been sketched hitherto, in detail. His book at once takes a place among those of first-class importance; comparable with Sir John Hawkins' *Horæ Synopticæ* (which so much impressed Harnack), *Oxford*

[1] So little has been written in criticism of this hypothesis that I have ventured to reprint a review of Dr. Vincent Taylor's *Behind the Third Gospel*. An article in reply by Dr. Taylor appeared in *Theology*, February, 1927.

Studies in the Synoptic Problem, and Dr. Streeter's book. It is exhaustive, a model of lucid investigation, and so well written that every page can be read with pleasure. The result is as follows:

Proto-Luke is a complete non-Markan Gospel, beginning with iii. 1, the elaborate dating of John's ministry. Its sections are iii. 1—iv. 30, v. 1-11 (Call of St. Peter), vi. 12-19 (Call of the Twelve), vi. 20—viii. 3 (" The Lesser Interpolation "), ix. 51—xviii. 14 (" The Greater Interpolation "), xix. 1-27, and the major portion of the Passion and Resurrection narratives. In the last section the removal of the Markan passages makes a consecutive story, so rich that it is highly improbable that it was confined to this section. In xxi. 20-36 (the Eschatological Discourse) St. Luke is using a non-Markan source later in date than Mark xiii., written when the siege was " in actual prospect or in immediate retrospect " (p. 120). Chapters i. and ii. are also of later origin. The Preface may well have been written last of all. As regards Q we note that St. Luke tries to impose on it a narrative form; Q is always used with non-Markan matter, never fused with Mark.

Proto-Luke rests on the sources discovered by St. Luke in A.D. 60—traditions largely connected with the Court of Herod, the Samaritans, the Women, the Seventy, and Jerusalem. The Evangelist wrote out his notes later, but in the absence of a Galilæan tradition " could proceed no farther with his task until he lighted upon the Gospel of St. Mark " (p. 213), which was for him " a valued secondary source " (p. 134).

Some such theory as Dr. Streeter's, thus elaborated by Dr. Taylor, is bound to dominate English-speaking Synoptic criticism in the near future; French and German scholars will probably take less kindly to a British theory! It is therefore desirable that objections should be stated as soon as possible. The following are some of the queries which arose in the reviewer's mind, though difficulties such as these do not prevent his giving the warmest welcome to Dr. Taylor's work. (That caution is necessary appears from Dr. Taylor's novel application of the argument from silence. Referring to certain Markan passages absent from Proto-Luke, he says: " The silence of Proto-Luke . . . [suggests] that they are examples of

naïve popular tradition of restricted provenance and late date.")

1. "The *existence* of Proto-Luke . . . is a scientific hypothesis which is, to a considerable extent, capable of verification" (Streeter, p. 218). Is this really so? Mark we know, Q also—from Papias' enigmatic fragment: Proto-Luke must always remain a scholar's hypothesis, compared with Mark the Unknown by the side of the Known.

2. The excellence of Luke's Passion-narrative is a sheet anchor of the theory, but we may well imagine sources of this part of the Gospel-story which did not extend backwards.

3. Is it not multiplying entities *præter necessitatem* when such considerable sections of the special matter of Luke as Chapters i. and ii. and the Eschatological Discourse are excluded from Proto-Luke?

4. The greater part of Luke is said to come from non-Markan sources which the author prefers to Mark, and to represent a tradition certainly of equal, perhaps of superior, value to Mark. The Markan part of Luke is generally acknowledged to contain very many editorial touches which represent a later stage in the tradition. Why did St. Luke, who had access to such good early sources, feel it necessary to tone down the vivid details of the Second Gospel? Granted the truth of the hypothesis, should we not suppose that the non-Markan part of his Gospel is related to the assumed earlier document as the Markan part is related to our Mark, i.e. that it is to a large extent secondary?

5. The advocates of the new theory have not, so it seems, studied the bearing of recent German Synoptic criticism upon their conclusions. This may be summed up in Dibelius' dictum, that Q is not a writing at all, but a *stratum*.[1]

6. Proto-Luke is said to be "a complete Gospel." Omitting the last visit to Jerusalem, we find that 51 verses refer to John's preaching, the Baptism and Temptation; 119 to the Galilæan Ministry; and no less than 378 to the Last Journey to Jerusalem. No wonder St. Luke avoided publishing so disproportioned a Gospel!

7. The explaining away of Markan influence is carried to

[1] See p. 23, above.

an excess. Thus, in the Baptism story, " the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose," and " *Thou art* my beloved Son; *in thee* I am well pleased " are sentences in which Luke and Mark agree as against Matthew. It seems perverse to rule out Markan influence on Luke.

Again, Dr. Taylor ascribes Luke vi. 12-19, the Call of the Twelve, to Proto-Luke. Would he have done so if the document without this section had not been left with the Sending of the Seventy only—and that during the Last Journey to Jerusalem ? St. Luke follows Mark very closely. Note that the second group of four apostles in Mark and Luke is identical: Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Thomas. Matthew varies the order slightly, Acts more considerably.

8. Where necessary, Dr. Taylor attributes very free editing of Mark to St. Luke, as in the stories of the Sick of the Palsy and the Transfiguration, though in the lattter case he suspects the influence of a non-Markan source. The same degree of editing in other passages is held to preclude the use of Mark, and to point to a non-Markan (and parallel) source. This seems arbitrary.

9. Lastly—and this is perhaps the most serious objection—St. Luke, collecting material in Palestine in 60 A.D., was unable to secure any information to speak of about the Galilæan ministry. Nearly ten years later, in a Gospel written for the Roman Church, the information turned up. The theory, claimed to be a rehabilitation of early Christian tradition, really lands us in radical scepticism. What value can we attach to Mark in these circumstances ?

The theory, so it seems, needs restatement somewhat on these lines. St. Luke, visiting Palestine, secured the best information he could from all sources, oral and written (*cf.* the " many " of the Preface). He visited Jerusalem and Cæsarea, the latter city being nearer to Samaria than to any other division of Palestine, and met the daughters of Philip (Acts xxi. 8). These facts suggest an origin for much of his special material. But he also collected much Q and Markan material. The supposition that he first saw a copy of Q in later years at Rome, and one of Mark at a still later date, has little significance unless we hold a rigid documentary theory and isolate the

documents from the traditions which they represent. In Palestine St. Luke made extensive notes for his book. Were they salved from the shipwreck? Is it not possible that he had to rewrite them from memory and that this accounts in a measure for the freedom of his editing? At Rome he met St. Mark and must have exchanged ideas. In a community which wrote letters so freely as the early Church did we cannot exclude the possibility that he sent to Palestine for further information. Ultimately he read St. Mark's Gospel. Naturally he used written documents where they were available, but we must leave the door open both for considerable use of oral tradition and for a creative effort on the part of the Evangelist, who fused very diverse material into an artistic whole.

VIII

THE OVERSHADOWING OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY

DR. J. K. MOZLEY in *Essays Catholic and Critica* p. 201 *f.*, writes: "May we not lay stress on the part actively taken by the Blessed Virgin in co-operation with God, coming along the avenues of mystical experience? . . . Mary did all that she could do, by making her will one with the will of God, to make it, from her side, possible for the Son of God to be born of her."

This is so interesting a suggestion that the crucial verse Luke i. 35 deserves a close examination. The angel said: "(The) Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and (the) power of the Most High shall *overshadow* thee" (Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι). What is the exact meaning of ἐπισκιάσει, and can we press the meaning when ascertained?

Dr. Box in *The Virgin Birth of Jesus*, p. 37 *ff.*, gives what is generally considered the best explanation. The verb is that used in the LXX of Exodus xl. 35, of the cloud which rested on the Tabernacle when it was filled with the glory of the Lord. He refers to the narratives of the Transfiguration, where the same verb is used of the cloud, and quotes Prof. Briggs, who in *The Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 50, writes: "The entrance of God into His tabernacle and temple to dwell there in a theophanic cloud would naturally suggest that the entrance of the divine life into the virgin's womb to dwell there would be in the same form of theophanic cloud."

A second explanation is that the second clause does not merely repeat the first after the manner of Hebrew parallelism, but introduces a new thought: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee (now, at thy conception), and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee (in the coming months)." "Overshadow" is used in its primary Greek sense of "shelter"

"protect." Protection is peculiarly needed by women at such periods of life, when according to primitive ideas they were exposed to the power of evil spirits. So the woman in Apoc. xii. was pursued by the dragon; *cf.* Elisabeth's hiding herself (Luke i. 24) and Mary's visit to her elderly relative. This view is in our opinion correct, as will be shown below.

A more radical change of view is demanded by Leisegang (*Pneuma Hagion*, 1922) and Norden (*Die Geburt des Kindes*, 1924). Norden adds appreciably to Leisegang, but for convenience the two may be grouped. The LXX does not explain the difficult word. A cloud, as in Exodus, casts a shadow, but does a δύναμις? The explanation must be sought along the lines of Hellenistic mysticism. "Overshadowing" is explained by some striking passages of Philo. Thus, commenting on Gen. vi. 4, Philo says that so long as the pure light of reason shines in the soul no false angel can come in; but when the light of reason is darkened and *overshadowed* (ἐπισκιασθῇ) the companions of darkness congregate and produce offspring for themselves, not for God (*Quod deus immutabilis*, 1). And on Gen. xv. 12 (ecstasy fell on Abraham at sunset, LXX): Our *nous* is symbolically called the sun. "When it comes to set, ecstasy and divine possession and madness come upon us, as one would expect; for whenever the divine light shines, the human light sets, and when the divine sets, the human reappears" (*Quis rer. div. her.* 53; *cf. de somn.* i. 29). Overshadowing, then, is a technical term in Hellenistic mysticism for the *unio mystica*, St. Theresa's seventh stage of spiritual marriage. Delacroix in *Les grands mystiques Chrétiens* uses *obnubilation* to express this spiritual ecstasy (pp. 385, 407), a slight variation from the Vulgate *obumbrare* = ἐπισκιάζειν. Roman Catholic writers have reached the correct interpretation by sympathetic intuition. Norden quotes from H. Oswald's *Dogmatische Mariologie* (Paderborn, 1850): "The working of the Holy Spirit must have transported every fibre and vein of her pure body with the most blessed joy. . . . The virginal conception of Mary doubtless denotes a higher spiritual ecstasy, a transfiguring and swallowing up of the flesh by the spirit, a transporting of the whole humanity into the region of heavenly light." Prob-

ably Luke did not understand the meaning of the phrase he used; certainly the early Fathers went woefully wrong.[1] The use of ἐπισκιάζειν in the narratives of the Transfiguration strengthens this conclusion. The cloud overshadowing *them* has no meaning. But the Old Syriac[2] reading *him* preserves the original meaning, if not the authentic reading. The cloud ἐπισκιάζουσα αὐτῷ was a symbol of the *unio mystica.* Matthew and Luke have "them" and miss the sense, but "they feared as they entered into the cloud" in Luke ix. 34 has more point if the cloud is thought of as first enveloping Jesus.

We cannot dismiss such speculations on the ground that Philonic ideas had no vogue in the circles in which the Virgin Mary moved. Dr. Torrey has some weighty words in this connection. "We find it convenient to fence off Palestine from the rest of the Hellenistic world, when we are speaking of its (conjectured) philosophy of the Greek period, as though it had lived its own untouched life. There was in fact no such isolation. Jerusalem was a cosmopolitan city. . . . The connection with Egypt was always especially close. . . . How long a time would elapse before a literary masterpiece, circulating in Egypt, could find its way to Azotus, or Sidon, or Capernaum? Perhaps a decade, perhaps a few months." Such literature would have been mainly in Aramaic. During the war of 67-70 it was left to its fate, the more readily the more Hellenistic it was (*Harvard Theological Review*, October, 1923, pp. 310-313). Philo's speculations, sketched above, we may add, are specially said to be not his own but those of a school (ἔνιοι δὲ οὕτως ἐδέξαντο).

Though we must allow for the possibility of St. Luke's sources having been influenced by Philonic mysticism, it is a safe rule in interpreting him not to resort to Philo before exhausting the possibilities of the LXX. So let us now give all the Biblical usages of ἐπισκιάζειν.

There are four in the Old Testament.

(*a*) Ex. xl. 35 (29). καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνάσθη Μωσῆς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν σκήνην τοῦ μαρτυρίου, ὅτι ἐπεσκίαζεν ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἡ νεφέλη,

[1] See H. Smith, *Ante-Nicene Exegesis of the Gospels*, i. 226, for curiosities of interpretation in Clement, Origen and Tertullian.

[2] Supported by one Greek MS., see von Soden.

καὶ δόξης κυρίου ἐπλήσθη ἡ σκηνή. "And Moses was not able to enter into the tabernacle of witness, because the cloud *overshadowed* it, and the tabernacle was filled with the glory of the Lord."

(*b*) Ps. xc. (xci.) 4. ἐν τοῖς μεταφρένοις αὐτοῦ ἐπισκιάσει σοι, καὶ ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας αὐτοῦ ἐλπιεῖς. "On his back he shall (*overshadow*) shelter thee, and under his wings thou shalt hope."

(*c*) Ps. cxxxix. (cxl.) 8. κύριε κύριε, δύναμις τῆς σωτηρίας μου, ἐπεσκίασας ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλήν μου ἐν ἡμέρα πολέμου. "Lord, Lord, thou strength of my salvation, thou hast (*overshadowed*) sheltered my head in the day of war."

(*d*) Prov. xviii. 11. ὕπαρξις πλουσίου ἀνδρὸς πόλις ὀχυρά, ἡ δὲ δόξα αὐτῆς μέγα ἐπισκιάζει. "The possessions of a rich man are a strong city, and their glory greatly (*overshadows*) protects him."

We see at once that there is no LXX evidence for the required sense of ἐπισκιάζειν. In (*a*) the cloud naturally overshadows *a place*; in (*b*) (*c*) and (*d*) the primary Greek meaning of "shelter" "protect" is clearly right.

In the New Testament we have five occurrences. The Synoptists each have it in their account of the Transfiguration, where the cloud overshadowing the disciples must be taken in a concrete sense, as in Acts v. 15, of Peter's shadow. We are left with Luke i. 35, with which we started, and the two passages in the Psalms. In all three ἐπισκιάζειν refers to the dealings of God with the soul of the individual. The conclusion is that Luke i. 35, which comes in the two most strongly Septuagintal chapters of the New Testament, is to be interpreted in the light of the other two passages, and translated thus: "the power of the Most High shall *shelter* thee," i.e. during the coming months of danger—and not in the light of Exod. xl. 35, which refers to a place, not a person.

Further study of the Psalms corroborates this result. The 91st Psalm was so familiar to our Lord that verses 11, 12 ("He shall give His angels charge" etc.) could become a vehicle of temptation to Him. The word for God—"Most High," ὕψιστος—used in Luke i. 35 occurs in *vv.* 1 and 9. The idea of *v.* 4, "on his back he shall shelter thee, and under

his wings thou shalt hope," recurs in Matt. xxiii. 37 (=Luke xiii. 34). The whole Psalm must have been familiar in the circles in which Luke i. and ii. originated. The same image (of the sheltering of the head of a small bird) is found in the other Psalm, cxl. 7: "Thou power (δύναμις) of my salvation, thou hast sheltered (ἐπεσκιάσας) my head in the day of war." In fact in xci. 1, 4 and cxl. 8 we have all the words of the Lukan passage—δύναμις, ὕψιστος, ἐπισκιάζειν; and in xci. 11 there is a reference to angelic ministry. The theory that an ecstasy, capable of being described in later mystical language, was the accompaniment on Mary's side of the Virginal Conception is intrinsically attractive, but cannot be derived from the Greek text, which implies a quite different image, namely the sheltering of a trustful little bird under the wings of parental love.

IX

CHRISTIAN AND GREEK MIRACLE STORIES

THE present essay attempts to investigate the parallels between the miraculous narratives of the New Testament and the similar stories current in the contemporary heathen world.[1]

I

An obvious but misleading method of treating the subject is to adduce parallels from pagan sources to certain New Testament miracles which it is possible to illustrate in this manner. For instance, by the side of the Raising of the Widow's Son at Nain[2] may be put the similar miracle told of Apollonius of Tyana.

> A girl had died just in the hour of her marriage, and the bridegroom was following her bier lamenting as was natural his marriage left unfulfilled, and the whole of Rome was mourning with him, for the maiden belonged to a consular family. Apollonius then, witnessing their grief, said: "Put down the bier, for I will stay the tears that you are shedding for this maiden." And withal he asked what was her name. . . . Merely touching her and whispering in secret some spell over her, (he) at once woke up the maiden from her seeming death; and the girl spoke out loud and returned to her father's house, just as Alcestis did when she was brought back to life by

[1] The Essay was first published in 1914. I have thought it worth reprinting because very little of importance seems to have been written on the subject during the intervening period and the English reader is not well provided with literature on it. Nothing is said about this particular problem in the article on "Miracles" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*; nor does a thorough discussion of the miraculous in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* refer to it. The post-War interest in the subject has been rather in the psychological than the literary side; see, *e.g.*, E. R. Micklem's *Miracles and the New Psychology*. Such references as I recollect seeing in recent German books have been mainly to the possibility of floating fabulous tales having attached themselves to the story of Jesus.

[2] Luke vii. 11-16.

> Hercules. . . . Now whether he detected some spark of life in her, which those who were nursing her had not noticed—for it is said that, although it was raining at the time, a vapour went up from her face—or whether life was really extinct, and he restored it by the warmth of his touch, is a mysterious problem which neither I myself nor those who were present could decide.[1]

Tacitus records a story about Vespasian which resembles a narrative in St. Mark.[2] A blind man came to the Emperor at Alexandria and besought him to anoint his eyes with spittle, having been bidden to come by the god Serapis. Vespasian hesitated at first and asked the advice of doctors, whether such blindness was curable. On hearing the opinion of some that a cure was not impossible, he boldly did as requested, and the man regained his sight. Another trait in the same narrative—" and he looked up and said, I see men as trees, walking "—may be illustrated from an inscription at Epidauros recording a cure in the fourth century B.C. A certain Alketas, " a blind man, had a dream. It seemed as if the god came and passed his fingers over his eyes, and he saw first *the trees* in the temple. And when day came he went away cured."[3]

It would not be difficult to bring many similar passages to illustrate the Gospel narratives. But, as has been hinted above, there is an error of method when the subject is treated thus. For the purpose of establishing parallels, an arbitrary selection is made from the whole mass of pagan miracles, and there is a danger of losing sight of the fact that there are many types of story found in the ancient heathen world which are not represented in the New Testament. To gain a correct impression, the pagan stories must be studied as a whole, and for their own sake. This we proceed to do under the guidance of two German scholars, Weinreich and Reitzenstein.

[1] Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii*, iv. 45 (Conybeare's translation). See p. xiii of the Introduction for the reasons that make any Christian influence on the *Vita* improbable. Norden in *Agnostos Theos* (1913) maintained that Acts xvii. was modelled on a report of Apollonius' experiences at Athens, such as was afterwards used by Philostratus. But see p. 119 below.

[2] *Hist.* iv. 81, *cf.* Mk. viii. 22-25, vii. 31-35. The story is also told in Suetonius, *Vesp.* 7 and Dio Cassius lxvi. 8.

[3] Fiebig, *Antike Wundergeschichten*, p. 6.

II

In his *Antike Heilungswunder : Untersuchungen zum Wunderglauben der Griechen und Römer* (1909) Weinreich studies the beliefs of the ancient world as to miraculous cures. He begins with an important *caveat*. It is essential to divest our minds of modern presuppositions. For the thinkers of the ancient world there was no antithesis between miracles and the ordinary operations of nature. Every divine action could be thought of and described as miraculous, even though the event took place in a perfectly normal way.

The subject is treated under three heads: (i.) the miraculous power of the hand; (ii.) healing through dreams; (iii.) statues and pictures with healing power. The first and second overlap to a certain extent.

(i.) A common figure in early times is the god, generally Asklepios, though other divinities, such as Hygieia or Artemis Eileithyia, also occur, depicted as lifting up the hand or extending it over or on an object. As a rule he comes in a dream, and the sufferer perceives him holding out his hand and touching the affected part. The temple of Asklepios at Epidauros was a great resort for invalids, though at the beginning of our era the Asklepeum at Rome on the island in the Tiber rivalled its fame. For the Emperor Julian, as for many other Neo-Platonists, Asklepios took the place of Jesus Christ as Saviour and Healer. " Asklepios," he says, " came down from heaven on to the earth, and appeared in a single human form at Epidauros; then growing up he went forth on his journeys and stretched out his healing hand upon all the earth. He went to Pergamum, to Ionia, to Tarentum, and finally he went to Rome."[1] So widespread was the idea of the hand of the god as the means through which the cure came that " the hands of the gods " was a recognized term for medicines. But a healing power in the hand of a human wonder-worker, corresponding to the power of the divine hand, is but rarely met with, and scarcely at all outside the legendary Lives of the

[1] *Contra Christ.*, p. 200, ed. Neumann, quoted by Weinreich, p. 32.

philosophers.[1] To a certain extent the hand was thought of as detached from the body,[2] but more fundamental was the idea of it as conveying force from one to another; thus the touch of the god could convey beauty as well as healing.

(ii.) Weinreich discusses dreams separately from the foregoing, though at times the two overlap, as when in a dream the god lays his hand upon a patient. Some gods were considered bound to definite localities, so that it was natural to go on a pilgrimage and visit them. Hence arose the practice of Incubation, or sleeping at a temple. The cure was effected in two ways, by the direct action of the god during a dream, or by the revelation to the patient in a dream of the means whereby he could regain health. The former was the rule in earlier times, as we see from the Epidauros inscriptions of the fourth century B.C.[3] However, by the imperial period the latter method had come to prevail; the miracle had become rationalized. The prevailing type of malady had changed too. Lame or blind persons appear but rarely, and the sufferers seem rather to be neurasthenics. These changes coincided with an ever-increasing vogue of such methods. In the first century A.D. all classes were turning to Asklepios or other healers, such as Serapis or Isis. The movement was world-wide and connected with the downward tendency of medical science. Faith-healing seems to have taken the place of research and observation of nature. The tendency had its religious importance, for the Stoics championed the miraculous cures against the scoffing Epicureans, finding them valuable as evidences of God's active Providence.

(iii.) The third part of the book deals with the healing power possessed by statues or images, in which was thought to reside the virtue of the god or hero they represented.

It will be noticed that a great part of the subject as thus described is unrepresented in the New Testament. No parallels are to be found except in the second half of the first section, that is, miraculous powers residing in the hands of

[1] *E.g.*, Erasistratos *ap.* Plutarch and Herophilus *ap.* Galen; see Weinreich, p. 37.

[2] *Cf.* Lk. i. 66: "The hand of the Lord was with him."

[3] See Fiebig, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-11.

human wonder-workers, and Weinreich warns us that these are rare in the heathen sources. But the second and third divisions of the subject, if absent from primitive Christianity, are fully represented in later Christian times, as we shall see presently when we consider the Lives of the Saints.[1]

III

Reitzenstein in *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen* (1906)[2] approaches the problem from the standpoint of a scholar thoroughly versed in the syncretism of the Hellenistic age, inclined to minimize unduly the part played by the Jewish elements in early Christianity; he treats the question as a problem in the history of literature.

His most important contention is that the miracle story (*Wundererzählung*) formed a separate literary type, to be distinguished from true history on the one hand and from romance on the other. The composer of such tales was an "aretalogus," or teller of God's mighty deeds. The style had become fixed largely through the influence of professional story-tellers attached to temples, who wrote down the miraculous cures achieved by the god for the benefit of illiterate people. Cicero discussed the method of relating the history of a hero. It is legitimate to consider æstheticism; those who deny its claims show ignorance. In writing pure history the author must aim at telling the simple truth, but the poet may consider the giving of pleasure as well (*utili miscet dulce*); though, if he were to use free invention exclusively, he would be a liar. Lucian, influenced probably by this passage of Cicero, gives similar directions.

> The panegyrist has only one concern—to commend and gratify his living theme some way or other; if misrepresentation will serve his purpose he has no objection to that. History, on the other hand, abhors the intrusion of any least scruple of falsehood. . . .

[1] *Cf.* art. "Health and Gods of Healing (Greek)" in *Enc. of Rel. and Ethics* for a study of part of our subject.

[2] Further material will be found in the same writer's *Historia Monachorum und Historia Lausiaca* (1916).

> I would not be understood to exclude eulogy from history altogether; it is to be kept to its place and used with modera tion. . . . It is true, there is a school which makes a pretty division of history into the agreeable and the useful, and defends the introduction of panegyric on the ground that it is agreeable and pleases the general reader. But nothing could be farther from the truth. In the first place the division is quite a false one; history has only one concern and aim, and that is the useful; which again has one single source, and that is truth.[1]

It seems then that scientific history was well understood by the literary authorities of the day, who considered that the introduction of miracle and the visible intervention of the gods in human affairs changed a narrative from history into aretology. Possibly the widespread influence of Plato's method of teaching religion by means of myths assisted the development of this type of literature. The writers thereof were earnest, deeply religious men, who practised falsehood, judged by standards of scientific accuracy, without perceiving it as such. They were actuated by religious motives, a desire to proclaim the works of God and to edify souls.

Reitzenstein would maintain then that the Gospels and the canonical Acts were not composed in the first instance as histories, but were the earliest products on Christian soil of the mode of composition thus described; the second stage appearing in the Apocryphal Acts, and the third in the Lives of the Saints, for example the Life of Antony and the Lausiac History of Palladius. Two or three instances in which heathen tales were applied to Christian saints will show the strength of his case as regards the third stage.

Lucian speaks of a magician who freed a district from a plague of snakes; the same story reappears in Jerome's Life of Hilarion, where it is told of the Saint.[2] In the same book Lucian relates that a certain Cleodemus fell ill and was conducted down to hell by a handsome young man. He was brought before Pluto, who was very angry, and declared it was the wrong man. Cleodemus heard the name of the right man, a neighbour of his, mentioned; presently he came to

[1] *The Way to Write History*, 7, 9 (Fowler's translation).
[2] Lucian, *Philopseudes*, 11; Jerome, *Vit. Hil.* 39.

himself and soon recovered from his sickness, only to hear of the death of his neighbour. The same story is told by St. Augustine as having happened to one of his converts, and again by Gregory the Great, who declares that it happened to a friend of his.[1] Another example is found in the Lausiac History. A monk named Serapion in the course of his travels reaches Rome, where he discovers a nun famous for her sanctity. In order to test her, he challenges her to walk with him through the streets of Rome naked. She refuses and he reproaches her with being not really dead to the world; the narrator remarks that Serapion showed many other marvellous proofs of "apathy." This story cannot be original in the present connection. The characteristic attitude of asceticism in such matters was not shamelessness but an exaggerated sense of shame. The story clearly was originally told of some Cynic philosopher and transferred to a Christian ascetic.[2]

The argument is worked out so clearly that the reader awaits with impatience the author's treatment of the New Testament miracles. It comes as a surprise to find that, with one exception, they are not considered at all. One can only suppose that they do not lend themselves to such treatment. The exception does not give us confidence in the applicability of Reitzenstein's method to the New Testament. The prison story in Acts xvi. resembles a similar one in the Acts of Thomas. Reitzenstein is inclined to believe that both conform to some pagan story as yet unknown.[3]

IV

Some Christians will think any attempt to co-ordinate Our Lord's miracles with those wrought by His contemporaries an act of irreverence. But Jesus Himself referred in the same

[1] *Dial.* iv. 36.

[2] I leave the argument as it originally stood, but refer to my edition of the Lausiac History, p. 127, for reasons for thinking the story may be true after all.

[3] P. 121. On the whole subject Wendland's *De fabellis antiquis earumque ad Christianos propagatione* (1911) may be consulted.

breath to the cures of demoniacs wrought by the Pharisees and to His own cures. "If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out?"[1] The early Church had no objection to acknowledging that the heathen could work miracles; it confessed the truth of the miracles but ascribed them to the assistance of demons. Thus Eusebius discusses the alleged miracles of Apollonius of Tyana and concludes: "These then are the achievements that preceded his accusation, and it behoves us to notice throughout the treatise that, even if we admit the author to tell the truth in his stories of miracles, he yet clearly shows that they were severally performed by Apollonius with the co-operation of a demon."[2] Even in the Life of Antony, which abounds in marvellous occurrences of all kinds, the Saint is made to acknowledge the miraculous gifts of foresight possessed by the Greeks, while deprecating the attaching of importance to such things.

> So if the demons sometimes do the same (forecast the future) by guesswork, let no one wonder at it or heed them. For what use to the hearers is it to know from them what is going to happen before the time? Or what concern have we to know such things, even if the knowledge be true? For it is not productive of virtue, nor is it any token of goodness. For none of us is judged by what he knows not, and no one is called blessed because he hath learning and knowledge. But each will be called to judgment in these points—whether he have kept the faith and truly observed the commandments.[3]

The Gospels depict Our Lord as working miracles, not in a haphazard manner but in accordance with a definite plan. Prefixed to the account of the Ministry in the First and Third Gospels is the narrative of the Temptation, the main issue of

[1] Matt. xii. 27.

[2] *Treatise against Philostratus*, 31 (*cf.* Conybeare's edition of Philostratus ii. 565). In ch. 35 (Conybeare ii. 575) Eusebius makes what at first sight seems an acute bit of criticism. Referring to the story of Apollonius having struck off his fetters in the prison at Rome, he says that Damis would not have been so surprised if he had really witnessed earlier miracles of his master. But in the same way the Gospels represent the disciples of Christ as perplexed to the end at His actions in spite of their opportunities of observing Him.

[3] Athanasius, *Vit. Ant.* 33 (Bp. Robertson's translation).

which is the decision as to the lines on which miraculous powers were to be exercised. They were not to be used for His own benefit or to impose belief upon unwilling minds. It is difficult to account for the narrative, unless on the supposition that it goes back ultimately to Our Lord. His conduct during the Ministry seems to have been based on the principle then laid down. He saved others, Himself He could not save. Asked for a sign from heaven, He replied: "There shall no sign be given to this generation."[1] Unbelief in those to whom He might have ministered prevented them from receiving the benefits that should have been theirs.[2] Our Lord is represented as working miracles, but with limitations and under restraints imposed by His own will and by outward circumstances. Professor Deissmann writes: "As a matter of fact the miracles gave to the New Testament a singularly popular position in the world around it. The whole ancient world is full of miracles; definite types of miracle become fixed by the tradition of thousands of years and occur again and again in all sorts of places. Viewed amid the surroundings of its own age and social stratum the New Testament is seen to be shy, rather than otherwise, of narrating miracles. The New Testament, as it was bound to be, *is* a book of miracles. If, however, we have once grasped historically the nature and necessity of the miracles of the New Testament, we realize also how dear they are to the heart of the people, how childlike is their piety, how sincerely beautiful, and what high value they can even possess as revelation."[3]

"Its own age and social stratum"—let us expand these words. It was an age in which miracles were expected. The Golden Age of Greek science[4] had now been left behind, and religion had awakened to new life. A familiar instance may be recalled. The author of Luke-Acts was a doctor.[5] He must have been acquainted with the view of Greek medicine, set out centuries earlier by Hippocrates, that epilepsy was not,

[1] Mark viii. 12

[2] Matt. xiii. 58, Mark vi. 5, Luke iv. 23 *ff.*

[3] *Light from the Ancient East* (1910), pp. 393 *f.*

[4] See p. 213.

[5] Or else he was a well-educated layman, in which the argument would be only slightly affected.

as popularly supposed, caused by a demon. Yet he ascribes a case of epilepsy to demoniac possession,[1] and even, in a passage not paralleled in the other Gospels, attributes curvature of the spine to the same cause.[2] He was therefore influenced by the atmosphere of his time, and its readiness to give religious rather than scientific explanations must have affected his view of such things. Further, the social stratum in which Our Lord worked must not be forgotten. "The common people heard Him gladly." He went to them primarily, and among them He found His first disciples. It is natural to suppose that the belief in miracle found in all classes of the community at this period was most strong in the less educated circles of society, which, broadly speaking, are represented in the New Testament.

If so, it may be asked: In what other way than by the evidence of miracles could a first century teacher have been recognized as Saviour by the class to which Our Lord went? But, if Jesus Christ was what Christians hold Him to be, we should *a priori* expect that He would only to a very limited extent conform to the popular notions about miracles. This, we have seen, is borne out by the evidence. Some of the lower forms of heathen belief are not represented in the New Testament; the whole subject is lifted on to a higher plane, and invested with a moral dignity rarely met with in the pagan documents.

Our study has been confined to literary types; the fundamental problem is outside our scope. But it may be worth observing that in recent years theologians have "given miracles a rest," feeling presumably that nothing could with profit be added to a wearisome debate. When discussion is resumed it will be on new lines. Scientists no longer maintain the uniformity of natural law in the nineteenth century sense. The new theories of physics are so startling that they will take years, perhaps generations, to become absorbed in a system of consistent philosophical thought. Whatever position is ultimately taken up by instructed Christians in regard to miracles, it is safe to predict that nineteenth century rationalism will soon be generally recognized as obsolete.

[1] Luke ix. 38-42. [2] Luke xiii. 11.

X

THE MARRIAGE-FEAST AT CANA: A STUDY IN INTERPRETATION

I

FIRST let us ask what exactly the passage (John ii. 1-11) says.

In i. 43 Jesus, who is at Bethany (or Bethabara) on the banks of the Jordan, decides to go to Galilee. *And on the third day there was a marriage-feast in Cana of Galilee.* From the Jordan fords to Cana was three days' journey,[1] so this note of time is perplexing after chapter i. *And the mother of Jesus was there*, at the feast already. *Now Jesus* (on His arrival in the village) *was invited, and so were his disciples.* Nathanael was already known to the other guests, presumably, since he is described later as being of Cana.[2] *And when the wine was used up the mother of Jesus saith to him, They have no wine.* The mother of Jesus, whose place is seemingly with the servants, suggests that her Son shall help, by thus indicating the need. *And Jesus saith to her, Woman, what have I and thou in common?* In spite of all attempts to soften the force of this it remains abrupt. "Woman" is perfectly respectful, but the rest of the sentence indicates a radical divergence of outlook. Is there a parallel between this suggestion to use miraculous powers to augment the supply of wine and the temptation to produce bread in Matt. iv. 3 (=Luke iv. 3)? *Mine hour is not yet come.* That "the hour" came a few minutes later is improbable. Elsewhere in St. John "mine hour" is the hour of suffering and glory.[3] *His mother saith to the servants, Whatsoever he saith to you, do it*; she is apparently in a position of authority as regards the servants.

[1] Dalman, *Orte und Wege Jesu*, p. 189.
[2] John xxi. 2.
[3] vii. 30, viii. 20, xii. 23, 27, xiii. 1, xvii. 1.

Now there had been put there six waterpots of stone for the purpose[1] *of the Jews' ablutions, holding two or three measures apiece.* The water had been used for the preliminary ablutions. *Jesus saith to them, Fill the waterpots with water;* from cisterns, according to Dalman, there being no spring in Cana.[2] *And they filled them up to the brim. And he saith to them, Bale out now,* using no doubt the vessels in which they had brought the water, *and carry to the head-waiter.*[3] *And they carried* the vessels, the miracle taking place meanwhile. *When the head-waiter tasted the water that had become wine,* before he let the guests drink it, *and he knew not its source* (that Jesus was the giver) *but the servants knew, who had baled out the water, he, the head-waiter, hails the bridegroom and says to him, Every man first sets out the good wine, and when men are drunk* (and unable to distinguish) *the inferior;* the practice, though not attested in antiquity, is intelligible; *but thou hast kept the good wine until now.* After this beginning of miracles Jesus goes down to Capernaum with His mother and disciples and brethren; these last had apparently been present also.

II

Such is the story. Only our life-long familiarity with it prevents our seeing how unusual it would seem if we came across it for the first time, say in a newly-discovered papyrus. The miracle described differs completely from those found in the Synoptic Gospels. Scholars have been tempted to find symbolical interpretations for details which *prima facie* are straightforward. Here are some of them: "The third day," puzzling when taken literally, elsewhere in the New Testament

[1] For this use of κατά *cf.* Robertson's *Grammar of the Greek N.T.*, p. 608: "κατὰ with the acc. always expressed direction towards in the vernacular"; and p. 609: "In 1 Tim. vi. 3, κατ' εὐσέβειαν, the notion of tendency or aim appears."

[2] *Orte und Wege*, p. 95.

[3] The meaning of *tricliniarches* in Petronius. Liddell and Scott (1926) give "president of a banquet" for ἀρχιτρίκλινος, but refer to John ii. only. The other passage, in Heliodorus, is translated "head-waiter."

is always used of the Resurrection, when, His hour having fully come, Jesus manifested His glory. The Greek word for " marriage-feast " elsewhere in the New Testament, with one exception, is used in an eschatological sense.[1] Jesus comes to the wedding with five disciples,[2] the number with which the bridegroom of Matt. xxv. 10 went in to the feast.[3] Why *six* waterpots ? Six has a special meaning for the Evangelist. It signifies failure and death. The Crucifixion, which in Mark xv. 25 takes place at the third hour, in John xix.14 is at the sixth. In iv. 6 Jesus is wearied at the sixth hour. In iv. 47 the nobleman's son is at the point of death at the sixth hour, but at the seventh the fever left him; and in the Apocalypse, which may at least be used to illustrate the Gospel, the number of the Beast is 666 (xiii. 18), the number which in a three-fold manner falls short of the perfect number 7.[4] As a check to a possible readiness to accept such an explanation, I hasten to record Philo's symbolical meaning of 6—it is " the most productive " of numbers.[5] Whether or no we believe such senses to have been present in the mind of the writer, we shall at least recognize that readers of the second century, the century that witnessed the spread of Gnosticism, would have found them congenial.

Then, too, there may be something significant in *Cana of Galilee*. Cana (Aramaic *Qana*) is connected with the verb meaning " acquire " or " possess." Galilee may suggest the Gentile mission as in Matt. iv. 15, " Galilee of the Gentiles "; in which case Cana of Galilee may stand for the community, God's *possession* among the Gentiles. And in this connection Loisy's view may be noticed. He sees a meaning in the fact that in St. John we always have " the mother of Jesus " rather than " Mary," and connects her with the woman of Apoc. xii.

[1] Heb. xiii. 4 is the exception; perhaps also Luke xiv. 8, but this is called " a parable," and the original sense was probably eschatological.

[2] Andrew, an unnamed disciple, Simon, Philip, and Nathanael. See i. 40, 41, 42, 45. It is forced exegesis to find a sixth in i. 41, adding mentally: " and the unnamed disciple next finds his brother."

[3] *Cf.* Hommel, *Z.N.T.W.*, December, 1924.

[4] This, the simplest, explanation is not impossible. Such an idea of 6 is no doubt connected with the conception of the six secular days of the week falling short of the seventh, or sabbath; *cf.* Heb. iv.

[5] *De Dec.* 159, p. 206 M.

who fled into the wilderness for 1260 days[1] (a personification of the persecuted Church) rather than with the historic Mary.

III

But it will be best to attempt some classification of the supposed symbolic meanings. They can be discussed under three heads: (*a*) Johannine expansions of thoughts found in the Synoptic Gospels; (*b*) allusions to the Gentile surroundings of the Christians for whom the Gospel was written; (*c*) Eucharistic meanings.[2]

(*a*) With a few excisions the story can be turned into a parable of the Synoptic type.[3] (The translation given above is repeated.)

> The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto *a marriage-feast*, to which many were *invited. And the wine was used up. Now there had been put there six waterpots of stone for the purpose of the Jews' ablutions, holding two or three measures apiece. And the servants filled them up to the brim. Then they baled out and carried to the head-waiter.* And, as they carried, the water became wine. *When the head-waiter tasted the water that had become wine, and he knew not its source, but the servants knew, who had baled out the water, he, the head-waiter, hails the bridegroom and says to him, Every man first sets out the good wine, and when men are drunk the inferior ; but thou hast kept the good wine until now.*

Commentators would find little difficulty in expounding such a parable. The figure of the marriage-feast is too common to need explanation. The point of the story would be the contrast of old and new wine, and the teaching would be an expansion of Mark ii. 18-22, which tells how Our Lord

[1] The ministry in St. John apparently lasts three years. If the Baptist's ministry, like his birth, was considered to antedate the Saviour's by six months, the period covered by the Gospel is the Messianic time of three and a half years = 1260 days.

[2] As a curiosity we may record Bert's view (*Das Evangelium des Johannis*, 1922), who sees in the Gospel a drama of the soul's life mystically united with Christ—marriage (ch. ii.), birth, childhood, eating and drinking, sickness, death.

[3] This develops a suggestion found in E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 27, and elsewhere.

vindicated His disciples from the reproach of not fasting as the disciples of John did, adding that new wine could not be put into old wine-skins. The commentator would not press details, but the wine that failed would clearly be the old dispensation, and the new wine would be the Gospel, to begin with in Jewish receptacles. The bridegroom who was responsible for " keeping the new wine until now " at least suggests Our Lord, as in the Parable of the Ten Virgins, where the absence of the bride is best explained by a desire to avoid confusing the imagery.

The basic thought of the supposed underlying parable persists, it may be urged, in the " acted parable" of John ii. It is very appropriate in the present context, where the five disciples, or some of them, have just left John the Baptist; fasting is no longer required of them; rather do they, the sons of the bridechamber, feast in the company of the Bridegroom, who is distinguished from Jesus for the sake of the story.

(*b*) The choice by the Church of the miracle at Cana as one of the leading thoughts at Epiphany is a puzzle to congregations. Some ingenuity is needed to explain why the same feast commemorates the visit of the Magi to Bethlehem and the first miracle wrought by Our Lord at Cana thirty years later—for the benefit of Jews, not Gentiles. The wine-motive has been thought to provide a clue.

The Jews were brought into connection with the Dionysus-cult as early as Maccabæan times. See 2 Maccabees vi. 7, where we are told " they were compelled to go in procession in honour of Bacchus (Dionysus), wearing wreaths of ivy." The date of the chief feast of Dionysus was January 5-6; that is, the feast began on the night of the 5th. Possibly the Jews were compelled to observe this date and afterwards looked upon it with abhorrence. In the fusing of cults characteristic of the period Dionysus was identified with Osiris, also with Æon (=Latin *aetas*), whose births were celebrated at Alexandria on the same night.[1] Is it merely a coincidence that January 6 was the date of Our Lord's birth-festival in the Eastern Church, and that the miracle at Cana was attached to the same day in Church tradition? Did the Evangelist intend a reference to

[1] See p. 4.

the feast which was observed by his pagan neighbours? Did he say, in effect: Here is the giver of the true Wine—in the spirit of St. Paul at Athens: "What ye worship in ignorance, this set I forth unto you"? He has been thought to allude to the actual day of January. If the appearance of Our Lord in the Gospel may be taken as beginning a new year, then John i. 29 ("on the morrow") brings us to Jan. 2, *v.* 35 ("on the morrow") to the 3rd, *v.* 43 ("on the morrow") to the 4th. Then "the third day" of ii. 1 is the 6th, the date of the Epiphany.[1]

(*c*) St. Irenæus says: "Mary was urging Him on to perform the wonderful miracle of the wine and was desirous before the time to partake of the cup of emblematic significance";[2] and we may suppose that preachers generally in the second century would have been tempted to find a Eucharistic meaning in the Cana story.

There is an element of imaginative reconstruction in all descriptions of the primitive liturgy, but we may suppose congregations to have been familiar with some such scene as this.

The deacons received the people's offerings in kind, including wine, out of which sufficient was set apart for the consecration. This they brought to the bishop or president. After the Consecration Prayer they administered the Chalice to the communicants.

Now see how readily the narrative would suggest the Eucharist. All is done under the direction of Our Lord. The deacons (the word for "servants" is διάκονοι) bring the water, which stands for the unconsecrated wine, to the head-waiter, who symbolizes the bishop or president. He first tastes and realizes the wonder, that the true Wine is now present. Then the deacons distribute the Wine to the guests. The "do it" of *v.* 5 (ὅ τι ἂν λέγῃ ὑμῖν, ποιήσατε) may

[1] See Windisch, *Z.N.T.W.* (1913), p. 248 *ff.* The most ancient reference to an Epiphany-feast is in Clement of Alexandria, see Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 259. The evidence for the heathen feast will be found in Holl's edition of Epiphanius; also in Norden, *Die Geburt des Kindes*, and R. Kittel, *Die hellenistische Mysterienreligion und das Alte Testament.*

[2] *Participare compendii poculo*, the cap which *recapitulates* the sufferings of Christ (*Haer.* III. xvi. 7).

LIBRARY OF
RICHARD OUDERSLUYS

even have recalled the "do this" (τοῦτο ποιεῖτε) which instituted the Eucharist.

Can we test this supposed Eucharistic meaning? I think we can, with the help of chapter vi., the Feeding of the Five Thousand. There, as in chapter ii., Our Lord imparts one element of the Eucharist, using what the people offer, but raising it to a potency unknown before. The twelve disciples distribute the blessed bread, as the bishop does in the primitive liturgy.[1] They gather up twelve basketsful of fragments, that nothing be lost. Here again we seem to have an allusion to a Eucharistic feature, the distribution to the sick and the poor of such of the people's offerings as are not required for the actual service.[2] So far there is no advance in clearness of Eucharistic allusion beyond the Markan narrative. But three things in St. John, when taken together, make the Evangelist's intention unmistakable.

(1) He introduces a figure not found in the other accounts—"a lad" who offers the loaves and may symbolize the deacons.

(2) He changes the wording of St. Mark very slightly at a critical point, the better to suggest the traditional Eucharistic formula.

St. Mark (vi. 41) has λαβὼν τοὺς ἄρτους . . . εὐλόγησε. . . .

St. John (vi. 11) has ἔλαβεν τοὺς ἄρτους ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εὐχαριστήσας . . .

In 1 Cor. xi. 23 we find ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς . . . ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας.

The last phrase is a formula which St. Paul "received" from the apostolic tradition, and St. John's version has apparently been slightly altered to conform to the familiar form.

(3) St. John appends to the miracle a discourse of Christ in which its Eucharistic significance is developed.

The two miracles, so it may be argued, both illustrate the Eucharist, but in chapter ii. the Evangelist confines himself to a few deft touches that will suggest his meaning to the instructed reader.

[1] This must be read into the story, as in Mark. See Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 63. The bishop administered the consecrated bread, the deacon the chalice.

[2] See Wetter, *Altchristliche Liturgien*, reviewed below, p. 174.

IV

All this may seem to some a spinning of cobwebs. Why should not the story be an exact narrative of facts told by an eyewitness, or at least resting on his testimony? It may have been—I would not exclude the possibility. Those who hold the Gospel to have been written by the son of Zebedee will as a rule reject the complicated theories of the critics, though they are generally ready to concede a certain reshaping of the tradition, conscious or unconscious, for devotional and homiletic purposes. But others believe that a complex theory of the origin of the Fourth Gospel is more in accordance with the facts.

My own provisional theory is somewhat as follows—I give it in bare outline without attempting to justify it. A *corpus* of tradition, whether written or oral, existed in Palestine, at first in Aramaic, then in Greek. This *corpus*, could we recover it, would be recognized as equal in value to Mark or Q. In a measure that did not apply to Mark it represented the local needs of the Palestinian Churches. If we hold to the conclusions of the *formgeschichtlich* school, we shall say that, just as the special reason for preserving this or that narrative in Mark was the needs of the Roman Church, so the local knowledge and needs of the Palestinian Churches account for some of the features of the Johannine tradition. Eventually this tradition reached Ephesus. Perhaps when the Christians fled to Pella in 67 A.D., some went to Ephesus, and the legend of the Virgin Mary's sojourn there is a distorted reminiscence of historical fact. But at one point in its progress the tradition seems to have passed through Syria and to have been modified by the necessity of meeting Oriental Gnostic propaganda. I do not think the final editing at Ephesus altered the tradition much. By the side of this special Johannine tradition incorporated in the Gospel there was the Gospel of St. Mark, which was used to some extent in the making of the Fourth Gospel as we have it. At one stage the tradition was strongly influenced by homiletic needs.

This may sound unnecessarily complicated. But let us

suppose that the Third Gospel stood alone, the First and Second Gospels having perished. Its origin might then seem to us a simple problem, whereas in fact it is very complicated. The Fourth Gospel is isolated and the unknown *x* which stands to it as St. Mark (to say nothing of Q) stands to St. Luke is lost. If it were recovered, I should expect to find an earlier form of the Cana story, differing from the story in John ii. much as the story in John vi. differs from the Feeding of the Five Thousand as told in Mark vi. But I should not be surprised if the difference proved to be substantial. If the origin of the Fourth Gospel be as complicated as I suppose it to be, then opportunities will have arisen for drastic modifications of the Cana story as first told, and some of the suggestions given above may be seriously considered.[1]

[1] I add some additional notes.

(*a*) The Feast of Tabernacles has left its mark on the Fourth Gospel. *Cf.* Sukkah, Tosefta iii. 14 (ed. Greenup, p. 77): "There were two silver bowls on the top of the altar, one for water and the other for wine; that on the western side for water, that on the eastern for wine. If the priest poured the wine into that meant for the water, or *vice versâ*, he complied with legal requirements.

(*b*) Fr. V. McNabb in *Theology*, Sept. 1921, suggests that the Sacraments lie behind the scheme of St. John—i. 35, call of the disciples, Holy Order; ii. Matrimony; iii. Baptism-Confirmation; iv., v. Penance; vi. Holy Eucharist; xiii. Unction (?). I do not think this particular suggestion right, but the principle that underlies it, of accounting for the selection and arrangement of material in St. John by the needs of the worshipping community, is in my opinion justified.

(*c*) *The Logos as wine-giver.* See Philo *de Somn.* ii. 249 (p. 691 M) where ὁ οἰνοχόος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ συμποσίαρχος λόγος is said to be the only giver of true joy, and the Logos prefigured by Melchisedek gives ἀντὶ ὕδατος οἶνον.

(*d*) Saintyves in *Essais de folklore biblique*, chap. v., says that the turning of water into wine, so common in hagiography, where it is too frequent to be explained as a mere imitation of the Gospel, is widespread in antiquity. In the Golden Age fountains run with wine instead of with water; the miracle is attributed to Dionysus. The original rite was the putting of vessels of wine into water with the intention of increasing fecundity. Or wine was actually poured into the fountain (which was then said to have become wine) to symbolize, or rather effect, the changing of the water of the rain into the juice of the grapes. The later stories, which Saintyves, not very plausibly, maintains are a continuation of the popular beliefs of antiquity, not a copying of John ii., when they are dated fall within the period Dec. 25-Jan. 6.

(*e*) Billerbeck in his Rabbinic commentary says that in the early

Rabbinic sources there is no figure corresponding to " the ruler of the feast."

(*f*) Kundsin in his *Topologische Ueberlieferungsstoffe im Johannes-Evangelium* (1925) discusses the topographical details of St. John. They are accurate, far more so than those of St. Mark. The Gospel is the first witness to the stream of tradition found in pilgrim-literature. It dates from a time when sacred sites were cherished with reverent affection, and of this or that place fixed stories were told. Thus in the first chapter the fig-tree under which Nathanael sat would have been shown to the visitor, as also the place where Jesus abode—perhaps a cave which he was invited to " come and see." The Christian inhabitants of Bethany will have shown him the Lazarium and the tomb. The exact description of Calvary and the Tomb in the Garden corresponded to what the visitor saw.

Further, some of the incidents really describe what the Risen Lord did in His Church. Cana of Galilee was evidently an important centre of the early Church. The background of chapter iv. is the missionary work of the Church—" other men have laboured, and ye have entered into their labours " points to the second generation of missionary work in Samaria. In ch. vi. we have the memory of a split in the community at Capernaum, when the mystic-sacramental view prevailed over the Judaistic.

XI

TWO JOHANNINE TEXTS

(*a*) xiv. 1-4: *μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία· πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε. 2. ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρός μου μοναὶ πολλαί εἰσιν· εἰ δὲ μή, εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν· ὅτι πορεύομαι ἑτοιμάσαι τόπον ὑμῖν. 3. καὶ ἐὰν πορευθῶ καὶ ἑτοιμάσω ὑμῖν τόπον, πάλιν ἔρχομαι καὶ παραλήψομαι ὑμᾶς πρὸς ἐμαυτόν· ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἦτε. 4. καὶ ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω οἴδατε τὴν ὁδόν.*

THE second verse is a well-known *crux* of commentators. At least four translations are possible.

(*a*) R.V.: "In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you; for I go to prepare a place for you." "Christ reminds His disciples that as He has told them tidings of sorrow so He would not have withheld anything from them" (Westcott).

(*b*) "In my Father's house are many mansions (if it were not so, I would have told you) for I go . . ." The "for" clause explains why the mansions are many.

(*c*) ". . . Otherwise (if there had not been sufficient places all ready), I should have told you that I am going to prepare a place for you."

(*d*) ". . . Otherwise would I have told you that I go . . .?"

Of these (*a*) is very unconvincing. The resulting sense is: If there had been no place for you, I would not have withheld the bad news, because I am going to prepare a place. It is hard to get any intelligible meaning out of the last sentence. The idea of (*b*) is: There is room for all (as you quite rightly assume—had there not been, I would have told you) for I am going to prepare a place. But if there are places for all, ask the commentators, why prepare them? Against (*a*) and (*b*) is the overwhelming probability that *ὅτι* after *εἶπον* is recitative, corresponding to our inverted commas. Origen assumes this as self-evident. Commenting on xiv. 3, he says: "This seems

to contradict what has just been said. Above (v. 2) he speaks as if there was no need to prepare " (*Comm. in Joh.* fr. 105).

Westcott objected to (*c*) that the contradiction between vv. 2 and 3 makes it impossible. Wellhausen struck out v. 3 as eschatological and out of place in this connection. Loisy strikes out vv. 3-5 as redactional, due to a desire to bring in the Parousia.

Westcott objected to (*d*) on the ground that the question was abrupt. Probably it only seems abrupt because we are so used to the ordinary translation. A further difficulty is that no such saying as that referred to occurs in the gospel.

Let us attempt an independent study of the passage, assuming that ὅτι is recitative, and that the unexpected mention of the Parousia needs justification.

Let not your heart be troubled. This (and what follows) is more pointed if we accept the widely held theory of a dislocation in these chapters, so that xv. and xvi. should come before this passage.[1] In that case xvi. 29-33 has preceded. The disciples have said " we believe " (xvi. 30). " Do ye now believe ?" said Jesus (31), and told them that in the world they should have tribulation. He now takes up the word *believe*. *Believe in God and believe in Me.* The interpretation of the three verbs—ταρασσέσθω, πιστεύετε, πιστεύετε—as being all imperatives is probable. *Cf.* Mark v. 36: " Fear not, only believe."

I offer the following suggestions as to the thought underlying verse 2. The background implied is that of the Synoptic Gospels. There was no need to sketch it in, for the readers were familiar with it. The disciples were in a house, large and well-furnished, capable of providing quarters for many. Two of them had come in advance and made ready the places at table. During the meal our Lord's thoughts had been circling round

[1] If, through disarrangement of pages of the original MS., chapters xv. and xvi., which originally came between xiii. 31 *a* and *b* (*i.e.*, after " Jesus saith ") were transferred to their present place, a number of problems are solved. *E.g.*: (1) xiv. 31: " Arise, let us go hence " will then end the discourse, apart from the high-priestly prayer, as one would expect. (2) xiv. 30: " I will no more speak much with you " is no longer a paradox. (3) xvi. 5: " None of you asketh me, Whither goest thou ?" ceases to be a difficulty. At present, following xiii. 36 and xiv. 5, 6, where the question *is* asked, it is hard to explain.

the banquet in the Messianic Kingdom, see especially Luke xxii. 14-20. In the present passage these thoughts are alluded to.

In my Father's house are many mansions. Westcott thinks of the many chambers in the temple; also of "stations" or stopping-places along a road, so that the ideas of repose and progress are combined. But the word μονή can hardly mean at the same time a chamber in the temple and a rest-house along a road. It seems in itself to be neutral, and to suggest no more than "abiding place." "Quarters for you all" would convey the meaning accurately (*cf.* ὑπὲρ πολλῶν in Mark xiv. 24, where "many" means "all" rather than "some"). The Father's house is the house in which the feast of the coming kingdom is held (*cf.* Matt. xxii.; Luke xiv.). The mind of Jesus was dwelling on this feast. "I will not eat it [the passover], until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. . . . I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come" (Luke xxii. 16-18).

Otherwise, would I have said to you "I go to prepare a place for you"? Reserving for the present the question when this had been said, we notice that there is no contradiction between the many mansions and the preparation of a place, such as commentators have found. The upper room was "furnished and ready," but the disciples were bidden to "make ready for us" (ἑτοιμάσατε ἡμῖν, Mark xiv. 15). You have prepared for Me, is the thought, in this anticipation of the meal of the kingdom. Now I go to prepare for you. τόπος in Luke xiv. 9, 10 means a seat at table. The actual phrase "place prepared" (τόπον ἡτοιμασμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ) recurs in Apoc. xii. 6; as the woman is to be preserved in the wilderness, the sense of a place with food provided is required. That this interpretation of our passage is correct is suggested by a Logion of Jesus in the Oxyrhynchus papyri, if the lacunæ are rightly filled (see Evelyn-White, *The Sayings of Jesus*, p. 15, Saying III.).

λέγει Ἰη(σοῦ)ς·
οὐκ ἀποκνήσει ἄνθ[ρωπος τὴν ὁδὸν εὐ-]
ρὼν ἐπερωτῆσαι πά[ντα . . . διαι-]
ρῶν περὶ τοῦ τόπου τῆ[ς καθέδρας; εὑρή-]
σετε ὅτι πολλοὶ ἔσονται π[ρῶτοι ἔσχατοι, καὶ]
οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι· καὶ [ζωὴν κληρονομήσου-]
σιν.

" Jesus saith: Shall a man who has found the way not fear to ask . . . determining all things concerning the place of his seat? . . ." The collocation of " the way " and " the place " makes the reference to our passage unmistakable. " The place " is further defined as " the place of his seat," showing that our exegesis was known at an early date.

And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and will receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also. The difficulty, felt by some, of finding the Parousia in this verse disappears, if verse 2 is fully eschatological. Our Lord, having prepared the feast, welcomes His disciples as host. More than this, He comes Himself, saying, " All things are now ready." *And where I go ye know the way.* The way is, of course, death. " Where I go " (ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω) takes up the " whither goest Thou?" (ποῦ ὑπάγεις) of xiii. 36, which Peter, saying " I will lay down my life for thee," fully understood.

The objections I see to this exegesis are two. First, that if τόπος means place at table, the plural would have been more natural. But there was no τόπος for a party of three at an inn (Luke ii. 7). The second is more serious. When did Jesus say, " I go to prepare a place for you "?

The difficulty is not found here only. In i. 15 John says: " This is he of whom I said, He that cometh after me," etc. In vi. 36 our Lord says: " But I said unto you, that ye have seen Me," etc. To neither passage is there a close parallel in what has gone before. " I told you " (that I am the Christ) of x. 25 is justified only by the implicit teaching of what He has said so far. " Did I not say," etc. in xi. 40 refers perhaps to 4, 23, or 25, but there is no exact parallel. Loisy explains these apparently clumsy cross references by the redactor's lack of skill. In manipulating his sources he has failed to make consequential alterations. But perhaps the writer was satisfied with a general likeness to something said before. In this case the preparation of a place may be considered implicit in the teaching already given that Jesus was going to the Father, and they for the present cannot follow him. Thus xiii. 33, " Whither I go ye cannot come," and, if our hypothesis of the dislocation of chapters is correct, xvi. 7, " It is expedient for you that I go away "; *cf.* 16, which refers perhaps to the

Ascension and the Parousia, and 26-28. These parallels, though not very satisfactory, are as good as those which the commentators find to i. 15 and vi. 36—namely, in the general sense of the prologue and in vi. 26 respectively.

Is it too fanciful to suggest that Judas is the man who had on no wedding garment at the anticipation of the Messianic feast, and therefore went out into the outer darkness—where "it was night"?

(*b*) xxi. 15-17: "Simon, son of John, lovest (ἀγαπᾶς) thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love (φιλῶ) thee. . . . He saith to him again a second time, Simon, son of John, lovest (ἀγαπᾶς) thou me? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love (φιλῶ) thee. . . . He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of John, lovest (φιλεῖς) thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest (φιλεῖς) thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love (φιλῶ) thee."

Bishop Westcott's beautiful exegesis, alluded to in R.V. margin, is well known. The point of the passage lies in the two words for love. Ἀγάπη is the special word for Christian love, φιλία denotes the lower level of natural affection. Our Lord asks St. Peter twice whether he has a true love for Him. St. Peter dared not claim more than genuine natural affection. The third time our Lord comes down to the apostle's level and accepts all that St. Peter dares to offer. "Now the idea of loftiest love is given up." Is not this just the kind of exegesis which appealed to the great scholars of the nineteenth century, but can no longer be accepted? Against it the following considerations may be urged:

1. The distinction between higher and lower love is artificial. What is this higher Christian love which is to be distinguished from the love of our nearest and dearest? As St. Augustine says in his comment on the passage: "Demonstratur unum atque idem esse amorem et dilectionem."

2. The two Greek words both represent the same Hebrew word in the Septuagint, and, which is very significant, one

Syriac word does duty for both in the Syriac versions of this passage.

3. Peter was grieved that "lovest thou me?" was said for the third time. The obvious meaning is that the same thing had been said three times over.

4. An early Father, Justin Martyr, treats the words as synonyms (*Dial. c. Tryph.* xciii. 4).

5. A search in the Greek Fathers would probably reveal many examples of writers who presumably knew the shades of meaning in Greek words, missing the alleged distinction in quoting Scripture. The following have come to my notice lately in the second volume of St. Basil's works. In *Const. Mon.* 573 B., John xxi. 15 is quoted thus: φιλεῖς με πλέον τούτων; and in *Serm. de Ren. Saec.* 203 B., Matt. x. 37, "he that loveth father or mother more than me" is quoted with ἀγαπῶν in place of φιλῶν.

6. But the really decisive argument is the usage of the Fourth Gospel elsewhere. The two words are apparently interchangeable in ch. xi.—see verses 3, 5, 36, referring to our Lord's love for Lazarus. They are certainly interchangeable in iii. 35, v. 20, which speak of the Father's love for the Son.

Elsewhere we can safely say that the love shown by the woman who loved much (Luke vii. 47, ἠγάπησεν) was not higher Christian love. And Christ's love to the rich young man (Mark x. 21, ἠγάπησεν) is generally taken to be natural human affection.

XII

WHAT BECAME OF OUR LORD'S BODY?

IN recent years conservative theologians writing on the Resurrection have been greatly interested in the visions of the Risen Lord; the Empty Tomb has tended to recede into the background. We know too much about visions now to press the distinction between objective and subjective, so the contrast is between veridical and illusory. The veridical character of the Appearances is demonstrated by the whole history of the Church and especially by the astonishing life displayed in Apostolic Christianity, which has lifted the spiritual achievements of the human race to a new level. This is a promising line of apologetic. None the less, the question remains: Did the body of Jesus see corruption?

I

To begin with, the sources on which we rely must be carefully defined. It is advisable to exclude all evidence except what cannot seriously be disputed. So I propose to reduce the sources to a minimum and to follow closely in the steps of Professor Lake's famous book, *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*. The authorities for this purpose are three in number.

(*a*) *St. Paul's testimony in* 1 *Corinthians xv.* The apostle on going to Corinth delivered his testimony as regards the Resurrection: "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; he was buried; he rose (hath been raised) on the third day according to the Scriptures" (3, 4). In these words, so familiar to us from their incorporation almost as they stand in the Creeds, we clearly have a form of sound words, a primitive *Credo*.[1] They were "received" by St. Paul, obviously, at or soon after the time of his conversion, from the

[1] See p. 126.

Church at Jerusalem.[1] Had there been any deviation in his teaching from that of the original Apostles it would surely have been thrown in his teeth by his opponents and some trace of the accusation would have been preserved in the Epistles. St. Paul's conversion was probably not later than four years after the Crucifixion.[2] By 33 A.D. at latest, then, the belief enshrined in these words was held and was sufficiently well established to be formulated in set words.

We now scrutinize the words narrowly. "He died"—the subject is Christ or, strictly, Christ's human body. "He was buried"—the subject is once more the body. "He hath been raised"—again it is the body, or better the whole Christ, including the body. The one interpretation that is impossible is "Christ died; His body was buried; His spirit was raised, the body remaining in the tomb and dissolving in corruption."[3] That is to say, the Church at Jerusalem four years after the Crucifixion believed in the story of the empty tomb. Given Jewish beliefs on the subject of the Resurrection,[4] it is hard to understand how the Apostles could have confidently proclaimed the Resurrection had they believed the body of Our Lord to have corrupted.

Next we ask how far back we can trace the belief. The period prior to St. Paul's conversion was marked by one outstanding event, the emergence of a Hellenistic movement connected with St. Stephen. If we had to explain a change from a belief in a materialistic kind of Resurrection existing in the year 30 to a belief in a purely "spiritual" one in 33, we should be tempted to connect it with the rise of a Hellenistic movement. No one would maintain that a movement took place in a reverse direction and that the effect of St. Stephen's preaching was to alter an originally "spiritual" belief to a materialistic one. We are forced therefore to the conviction

[1] Lake says it is "almost certain that he derived some part of his teaching as to the appearances of the risen Lord from the early tradition which obtained, probably in Jerusalem, when he became a Christian" (p. 43).

[2] See my art. on "Chronology" in *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*.

[3] See Lake, pp. 191-4.

[4] As found, for example, in the Apocalypse of Baruch xlix-li (quoted by Lake, p. 24).

that the Church of Jerusalem believed in the empty tomb from the first.

(*b*) *The opening chapters of the Acts.* From these I take nothing but the bare facts that the Christians proclaimed the Resurrection with joy and confidence, that they came into conflict with the authorities as a result of their preaching, and that the story of Stephen as used above is historical.

(*c*) *St. Mark xv.* 42-*xvi.* 9, omitting verses 5 to 7, the encounter with the young man at the tomb.[1] This narrative is accepted by Professor Lake as trustworthy and primitive. It must for our purpose be read exactly as it stands, without introducing into it ideas based on the other Gospels. Jesus died long before He was expected to die. If the law of Deut. xxi. 22, 23 was to be fulfilled,[2] the body must be removed before sunset. Further, the Sabbath would begin at sunset and any action taken after that would involve a desecration of the Sabbath. So there was need of haste. Joseph of Arimathæa, a member of the Sanhedrin, went to Pilate and obtained leave to dispose of the body. The motive was presumably to avoid the breaking of the law. Joseph then bought a linen cloth, a bare minimum of decency, to wrap round the body. Next he proceeded to the place of Crucifixion, and had the body taken down and placed in a tomb. (We must assume the presence of servants who would carry out these works for Joseph. We may also assume that the rock-hewn tomb was near by, and was chosen for that reason. We are not told that the grave belonged to him, but at least he had power to use it for this purpose. We must not assume that the temporary resting-place was meant to be the permanent one). Joseph then had a stone rolled to cover the opening of the tomb. Two women were watching all this, presumably from some distance. Late on Saturday evening, when the Sabbath was past, the women bought spices in order to rectify what had been omitted in the hasty burial by order of Joseph. Next morning, very

[1] Since the women "were naturally in an overwrought state of mind, and on their own showing they fled when they heard the young man speak" (Lake, p. 248).

[2] "If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree; his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt surely bury him the same day."

early, they went to the tomb and found it empty, the stone rolled away.

Such was the earliest tradition. Arguing back to the facts that lie behind it, Prof. Lake suggests that the disciples returned from Galilee, after experiences which convinced them the Lord was alive, and received the testimony of the women to *their* experience as a confirmation of the inferences they had already drawn; just as the story of the disciples corroborated the inferences the women had drawn. He suggests further that the women may have made a mistake in identifying the tomb.

This reconstruction agrees so closely with what may be deduced from 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4 that we may accept it (apart from the final suggestion) with confidence *as a minimum*. In what follows we shall attempt to show that, if the orthodox interpretation is ruled out, we must fall back on some form or other of fraud or mistake, and that the arguments against either solution are very strong.

II

Let us endeavour to reconstruct the probable state of mind of the Sanhedrin, faced with a troublesome movement which refused to flicker out with the death of its leader, as they discussed the matter in the weeks following the Crucifixion. They could have stopped the apostles' preaching at once, if only they could have produced the dead body, or evidence of the corpse's having existed in a state of corruption before it became unrecognizable. There were no obvious methods of disposing of a corpse—no swift, deep river, no vast furnaces or powerful chemicals such as are familiar to us in modern romances of crime and detection.[1] The evidence of death was irrefragable; the centurion and his men, Joseph and his men, were agreed.

[1] *Cf.* D. S. Cairns, *The Faith that Rebels*, p. 45: "What became of the body of Jesus? We are told that somehow it was lost. Is it then so easy for a human body to get lost at any time? How it could get lost in the tempest of love and hate of the Jerusalem of that day, it passes the wit of man to determine. Was there no Antigone among all these women to stand by and remember the place of the body of the Lord? Is it likely that Mary was less loyal to her Son than the Greek maiden to her brother?"

The first theory the Sanhedrin would form would clearly be one of fraud, that the disciples had removed the body in order that their assertion of the Resurrection might be safeguarded from contradiction.[1] Nothing was easier than to subject them to cross-examination, as indeed the Acts tells us was done. At such an examination the details of the replies would vary, but the conviction that Jesus had been seen after His death and that the tomb was empty would remain unshaken. Is it likely that these simple-minded provincials would have consistently maintained their position throughout a cross-examination, if their *bona fides* had not been beyond reproach? Peter, we are told, broke down and lost his nerve at a sudden question from a maidservant. Judas Iscariot's defection would surely have been followed by the defection of others had there been an uneasy conscience anywhere among the disciples.

But might not Joseph of Arimathæa have been the cause of a mistake? Is it not possible that he never meant the afternoon burial to be more than a temporary measure, or that he subsequently changed his mind and had the body moved elsewhere? In reply to this misgiving we urge that there are two alternatives. For our present purpose we have used Mark only and assumed that Joseph was a member of the Sanhedrin, and was actuated by a desire that the law should not be broken. In that case, there was no motive for his deceiving his fellow-councillors. If on the other hand, as the Fourth Gospel says, he was a secret disciple, then what was said above about the *bona fides* of the first disciples becomes applicable. Human nature is complex, and Joseph *might* have moved the body and maintained an obstinate silence ever afterwards (*as also his servants*), actuated by motives at which we cannot even guess; but so improbable a contingency need not be seriously considered.

If fraud is excluded, we turn to the suggestion that the women went to the wrong tomb; the body remained continuously where it was put on Friday evening and the followers of Jesus never came to verify their identification, or, if they did, remained obstinately fixed in their mistake. The insuperable

[1] *Cf.* Matt. xxviii. 15.

objection to this theory is that Joseph could have cleared up the whole matter in a moment. He, or his men, must have still remembered where the body was laid when the proclaiming of the Resurrection began.

If these solutions are excluded, only one logical solution seems to be left. The body was there on the afternoon of the sixth day; it was not there on the morning of the first day. Therefore during the interval it had been removed. But by whom? Modern criminal investigation lays great stress on motive. What was the motive for removing the body? It must indeed have been powerful, to induce Jews to touch a dead body. We can imagine only two motives strong enough —love and hate. The body might have been removed by friends—but we have already seen the improbability of such a hypothesis. It might have been taken by enemies and thrown into the common pit for criminals out of spite—a last vengeance on the body from which the spirit had fled. But what possible motive could these enemies have had for keeping silence?

We are therefore thrown back on what seems the logical alternative to the tradition of the Church. The body must have been removed during the night of the first day of the week (Saturday-Sunday)—the night of the Sabbath may be excluded —by a person or persons unknown, neither friend nor enemy, actuated by motives so obscure that we cannot even hazard a guess at them.

And when we have got so far, perhaps we are as near the mystery as we can ever get. Perhaps it was a friend after all—

Hush, I pray you!
What if this friend happen to be—God?

XIII

THE ECONOMIC BACKGROUND OF THE BIBLE

IN our interpretation of an ancient document we may make progress by discovering new facts that elucidate it, or by looking at it with new eyes. Three monographs are here noticed, each of which in its own way uses the new economic outlook of our times in order to understand the Bible.

I

M. Lurje in his *Studien zur Geschichte der wirtschaftlichen und sozialen Verhältnisse im israelitisch-jüdischen Reiche* (Giessen, 1927) studies the economic and social condition of Palestine under the Kings. The writer, a Moscow professor, collects all the data and studies them from the Communist standpoint. The land was originally held in common, but in the frequent wars the big proprietors became predominant because they were responsible for raising troops. The proportions of the population represented by big landlords, rich peasants, landless proletariat and slaves are estimated. Probably the attempt to find an original Communism in Israel will be as unsuccessful as it has proved elsewhere. The key to the social conditions of Israel is surely that the Hebrews were a military aristocracy which gradually coalesced with the people of the land, but retained a supremacy which was eventually translated into economic terms. But Lurje makes many good points. David was obviously backed by the landless proletariat (1 Sam. xxii. 2, xxv. 10). Solomon made foreign trade a State monopoly, as Soviet Russia does to-day. The import of luxuries in his reign upset the balance of trade, which had to be rectified by the cession of twenty cities towards the end of Solomon's reign (1 Kings ix. 11). The prophets, except Amos, who was expelled by the Government as a dangerous agitator, were no democrats in the modern sense. They

accepted kingship as the normal form of the State. Their social programme was that the powerful should do right and not oppress the lower classes, not that the proletariat should come to its own. Though the attempt to rewrite Old Testament history in terms of modern Russian theory fails, the author is well qualified to contribute to Biblical science by reason of his freshness of outlook. Everything must look different to a Moscow professor who has lived through the Russian Revolution.

II

Dr. F. C. Grant's book on *The Economic Background of the Gospels* (1926) is specially welcome as an able study of an important problem. His thesis, in the course of which he collects much valuable information, is that Jewish Messianism in Our Lord's day was primarily an economic movement. Let us first summarize his argument.

The post-exilic Jewish community, as we find it in Haggai, occupied a small tract of about 600 square miles round Jerusalem. Politically considered, it was a semi-independent religious community, such as was common in the East; similar organizations were connected with the shrine of Atargatis at Bambyce, in Syria, and with the Temple of Zeus at Venasa in Cappadocia. Socially and economically such communities spelled stagnation or retrogression. Alexander's conquests led to a great expansion of commerce, and consequently of wealth, in which Judæa shared. The Epistle of Aristeas reflects the prosperity of the period. That the Maccabæans were enabled to withstand the Seleucid Empire was due largely to the economic strength of their little state. Prosperity continued, in spite of the damage done by the wars, down to the time of Herod, whose ambitious schemes impoverished the nation. The full cost of his policy was not felt until after his death in B.C. 4. Then the bill came in. On the top of it fell the full weight of taxation introduced by the Romans in A.D. 6 when they took over the administration. The religious system of tithes and dues, originally intended to cover all the needs of the community, was not abated at all, and the secular system was imposed as an additional burden. This double taxation made

Palestine seethe with unrest. There seemed but one outcome of the miseries of the time—the destruction of the present world-order and the inauguration of God's Kingdom; the motive-power of the Messianic movement was economic.

Palestine was far more productive than it is to-day, but suffered from the absence of the precious metals and from its prolific population pressing on or beyond the means of subsistence. We may safely estimate the population at two millions, about three times the present figure. The Diaspora was inadequate as a safety-valve. " The total taxation of the Jewish people in the time of Jesus, civil and religious combined, must have approached the intolerable proportion of between 30 and 40 per cent."

Confronted with these conditions, Our Lord preached renunciation and inner freedom. " He launched a revolutionary spiritual and ethical movement, whose full and final fruits must certainly include political, economic, social reformation, but which in itself involves vastly more than this."

Dr. Grant's theory differs widely from the ordinary view that Messianism was primarily political and religious, based on the prophetic promises and the memories of Maccabæan victories, and fanned into a flame by nationalist resentment against the Roman occupation and by religious jealousy for the honour of the Lord and His holy land. He does not shrink from consequences. Thus " render unto Cæsar," etc., is taken to mean " pay taxation to the Romans and also to the Temple." I think this must be rejected. Would the questioners have " marvelled greatly " (Mark xii. 17) at a teacher who told them to continue paying double taxes ?[1] Dr. Grant's thesis was one which was bound to be argued, and it could hardly have fallen into better hands; but it seems very vulnerable to criticism.

To begin with, I doubt whether the Jew of the first century was the average man of an economic text-book. Doubtless economic considerations should have weighed most with him, but did he not cheat our calculations by remaining obstinately " religious "? Then can we really do more than guess at the

[1] Perhaps they would, and perhaps the wonderful skill of the answer lay in its immediate application and universal implications.

relative economic condition of different decades of ancient Palestine? Is there any real evidence for the steady impoverishment of Palestine at a time when other parts of the Empire were enjoying a revival of prosperity owing to the cessation of wars and the better administration of the early imperial period? I feel throughout that Dr. Grant is pressing his case too strongly. The following are some of the objections which have arisen in my mind.

1. The spirit with which the Maccabees fought was surely the main factor in their triumph. The conditions of modern warfare, in which economic strength is necessary for the supply of munitions, did not exist then. Besides, Judæa has never been fertile and its economic strength cannot have been formidable. At an early date in the struggle Galilee was evacuated (1 Macc. v. 23), and Samaria was always hostile, so that Judæa was the only support of the Jewish armies.

2. It is an integral part of Dr. Grant's theory that economic decline set in as a result of Herod's expenditure on harbours, fortifications, cities, and the Temple. But the resources of civilization did not permit rulers to throw the cost of such works on posterity by floating loans. Yearly expenditure was met by income. The work was done mostly by paid labour, and some of it at least was reproductive. Harbours are generally reckoned to be reproductive; fortifications designed to stop brigandage and the incursions of desert marauders certainly were; so was city-building in a measure. The Temple was certainly a great drain on national resources, but its building was spread over 84 years, and it may well have attracted wealthy pilgrims and their offerings. We do not explain the Peasants' Rising of 1381 by the drain on national wealth caused by the excessive church-building of the Middle Ages.

3. Dr. Grant lays stress on the hopes of economic blessedness found in the Apocalypses. To prove his point he would have to show that this element came in after 4 B.C., "when the bill came in." But, to say nothing of the prophetic messages of a restored earth, Enoch x. 18, 19, verses which belong to a pre-Maccabæan date and *ex hypothesi* to a time of maximum prosperity, expresses the hope of miraculous plenty in the strongest terms.

4. Dr. Grant candidly states a fact which tells against his theory, Philo's assertions of the great wealth of the Jewish people, but says that these must be taken to refer to the Diaspora. Is it legitimate to draw this distinction? Even if it were, the wealth of the Diaspora was always flowing back to Palestine. Jerusalem must have been in an unsound state economically, with numerous "poor saints," because many of those who provided for the needs of the pilgrims at the festivals would obviously be without occupation at other times, but did the same conditions apply outside the capital? Dr. Grant does not mention Acts xii. 20, which shows that Palestine had an exportable surplus of food.

5. If the economic factor had been uppermost in the Messianic hope, we should expect to find it in the utterances of the disciples before they fully understood their Master. By unnatural exegesis Dr. Grant does find it in the questions addressed to John the Baptist, but what little evidence there is in the Gospel of the Palestinian St. Mark suggests that rule, rather than plenty, was uppermost in the disciples' minds.

6. Lastly, that 30 per cent. of the national income should be taken in taxation is not so extraordinary after all. Turkish pashas are said to have often extorted 50 per cent. And Great Britain pays about 30 per cent.[1] of its income in taxation, imperial and local.

We conclude that Dr. Grant has emphasized important factors too easily forgotten, and his work has permanent value, but that he has not succeeded in proving that the motive of economic betterment was the main cause of the revival of Jewish Messianism in Our Lord's time.

III

Karl Kautsky is a prominent figure in international Socialism and has conducted a controversy with Lenin and Trotsky. His book on the origins of Christianity, which was published

[1] Writing in 1905, Chiozza Money in his *Riches and Poverty* estimated the national income at £1,710,000,000. His figures were taken as near enough. Probably £3,000,000,000 would be near the mark now. Nearly £1,000,000,000 is raised by central and local taxation.

in 1908 and is in its thirteenth German edition, was published in an English translation in 1925 under the title *Foundations of Christianity*. Regarded as a contribution to New Testament study its value is very small; but its significance for contemporary history is great. Here we have " the Marxian conception of history " applied to Our Lord and His Church. Misleading and absurd as it appears to Christian scholars, millions of men accept it on authority as a scientific explanation.

From Dr. Shadwell's most valuable book on *The Socialist Movement* we derive the following summary.

Marxianism as an economic system is discredited by serious thinkers, but the class-war formula lives on. Primitive society is assumed without proof to have been Communistic. At some period which cannot be precisely ascertained the original system broke up and the law of social evolution began to operate. This law works " with the inevitability of a law of nature " (*naturnotwendig*) and is otherwise called " the materialistic conception of history." Class struggle is the key to history, and in all ages the conflict between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is the dominant factor. Social evolution is " scientific,"[1] and the Social Revolution inevitable. The rich are continually becoming richer, and the misery of the poor continually increases. The New International, founded at Hamburg in 1923, accepts the Marxian class-struggle as its basis. Clearly the materialistic conception of history is incompatible with belief in a divine power. " A real Marxian is always an atheist."

Kautsky claims that one who has taken part in the class struggles of his own day has an insight into the past which is denied to bourgeois scholars. However, he uses their results and does not conduct researches for himself. He is largely dependent on Pfleiderer, sometimes even on Strauss. The New Testament writings are assigned to late dates which have long ago been abandoned.

The world into which Jesus came was one in which the class-struggle was acute. Capitalism had accumulated enormous fortunes for the rich, and the poor, dragged down to the level

[1] " *Wissenschaftlich*," however, has a wider meaning than " scientific."

of slaves, were inspired by fury against their oppressors, and despaired of a remedy. The world was ripe for a proletarian movement. Galilee in the first century A.D. was utterly unlike Renan's idyllic picture. It resembled rather Paris during the Commune of May, 1871. Jesus was a rebel. His recorded utterances, when disentangled from the later glosses, show a savage class hatred against the rich. The story of the two swords in St. Luke, and the otherwise inexplicable betrayal of a secret by Judas, show that a *coup d'état* was contemplated.

The original congregations were proletarian—see 1 Cor. i. 26 and the Epistle of James. They favoured the mitigation of the slave's lot—naturally, as they were not slave-owners themselves; but they set back emancipation by giving a religious sanction to the slave's obedience. Despair of improving the present order led them to emphasize the other world. Their monotheism was a natural reflection in speculation of the political unity of the Empire, as later the nine orders of angels reflected the nine orders of nobles at Constantine's court. Communism, as practised at Jerusalem in the early days, remained the ideal, though it was a communism of consumption, not of production. Christianity for a long time drew its adherents mainly from the *Lumpenproletariat* (free parasitic population) of the big towns. When their slender resources were exhausted they were compelled to seek rich converts, and to modify their original hatred of wealth. This explains how a proletarian movement became eventually bourgeois. Cæsarism and Napoleonism similarly began as democratic movements.

Kautsky writes as an atheist, but his explanation of the Church's growth concedes a good deal to the other side. Christianity offered hope to the miserable slave-gangs. Domestic slaves, minions of their masters, whose vices they shared, were " full of a longing for a new, purer, higher life " (p. 71), and so turned to Christ. The old were captured through their fear of death, young aristocrats through their disgust of life (p. 418). But why should all these things have happened unless Christianity offered a reality and not a mirage ? And if atheists believe in " a new, purer, higher life," then

they are not far from us. Their atheism is formal and due to radical misconceptions of Christianity. Frequent references in Kautsky's book show that Christianity is associated in his mind with the pre-war Prussian State Church.

We need not delay over the assertion that Jesus was a rebel. The great output of pacificist literature in recent years may be consulted by anyone who needs arguments with which to reply. The Society of Friends and their sympathizers take Our Lord's words about non-resistance literally and explain away the few passages on which Kautsky relies. We may think their position illogical, but it is far preferable to Kautsky's method of concentrating on a few sayings and ignoring the bulk of Our Lord's teaching. A reader familiar with the Gospel teaching on Rich and Poor may think that the modern Church pays insufficient attention to the denunciations of riches, but, if he is candid, he will own that very careful statement is necessary and that " class-hatred " is not found in St. Luke, on which alone Kautsky relies.

Then was the early Church really proletarian ?[1] When St. Paul said that " not many wise, not many mighty, not many noble, are called " (1 Cor. i. 26), the natural meaning is that there are a few. St. James, who is relied upon to prove class-hatred, is evidence for the presence of some rich men in the Church (ii. 1-3). St. Paul's Epistles were meant to be read at assemblies of the brethren and presuppose a general level of intelligence which we should be glad to have in our modern congregations.

Marxian economics are utterly discredited. The theory of value, according to which the value of an article is the amount of labour bestowed on its making, is ridiculous. Nothing is easier than to make an article for which there is little or no demand, and which therefore is valueless. A publisher who accepts a book for which there is no demand, or a manufacturer dependent on the vagaries of feminine fashion, knows this to his cost. Marx's economic interpretation of history is equally wrong, if only because no one formula can explain the com-

[1] The *proletariat* in Ancient Rome were those who served the State only by having offspring (*proles*). Socialist writers do not intend this *nuance* when they use the word.

plexities of human life. Is there anything to be said for the theory that Christianity arose in a period of exceptional misery, to which it was the automatic response? The economic miseries leading up to and accompanying the break-up of the Empire in the West are familiar to all, but long before they had reached their height Christianity was firmly established. Among the causes of ruin were civil wars, military and bureaucratic extravagance imposing excessive taxes upon a declining population, the development of centrifugal tendencies in the provinces, perhaps malaria, certainly the exhausted fertility of the soil. If the civil wars which followed Nero's death are excluded, none of these causes was so potent in the first and second centuries as in the third and fourth. The general impression one gets is that the peace and security guaranteed by Augustus, and later by the Flavian Emperors, made the period when Christianity became established one of relative prosperity.

Mr. W. W. Tarn has a striking chapter on the social problem in the third century B.C. in *The Hellenistic Age* (2nd edition, 1925), founded mainly on the accounts of the Temple at Delos. This century brought prosperity to the upper classes, but for the poor it meant that prices were up and wages down. The secularization of the Temple treasures at Athens, Delphi, and elsewhere had caused a rise in prices before Alexander. Great economic disturbance resulted from Alexander's release of the Persian treasures, which amounted to perhaps 360,000 talents in coin and bullion. (Athens began the Peloponnesian War with 6,000 talents.) Though it was not understood at the time, this vast increase of gold and silver without a corresponding increase of commodities made prices rise.

The price of wheat is the best index to the economic position. Prior to the famine-year 329 B.C. the price at Athens was 5 drachmæ a bushel. This and the Delos price can be reckoned as the world-price, for both cities imported corn by sea. A skilled labourer at Athens was paid $2\frac{1}{2}$ drachmæ a day. By 300 wheat at Delos had risen to 10 drachmæ, and during the third century never fell so low as 5. Conditions at Delos were so favourable that workmen flocked there from the other islands. The nominal wage was 2 drachmæ a day for skilled

labour, half that sum for unskilled. But employment was intermittent. A certain Olympus, who in 302 got more employment than anyone else, made from 200 to 240 drachmæ a year. Certain skilled workmen compounded for 240 drachmæ a year in preference to the higher but uncertain daily wage. Clearly, then, a skilled labourer in the first half of the third century could not earn more than two-thirds of a drachma as a daily average, while wheat was 5 to 10 drachmæ a bushel (pp. 118-125).

Turning to New Testament times, we find that the rate for casual labour was a *denarion* (roughly equivalent to a drachma) a day (Matt. xx. 2). Dr. Bennett in Hastings' *D.B.* v. 359 states that wheat in New Testament times cost 16 to 20 shillings a quarter. Reducing this to *denaria* (pre-war francs), we get 20 to 25 *denaria* a quarter, say 3 to 4 a bushel. Dr. Charles in his note on Revelation vi. 6 says that a *chœnix* was a day's consumption of grain, soldiers being allowed double. A *denarion* in times of famine bought two *chœnices* of wheat. At other times it bought 8, 12 or 16 times as much. A *chœnix* is variously given as $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 pints. If we reckon it as 2 pints, and give the figures in bushels, a bushel costs 2 to 4 *denaria* in normal times, a result near enough to Dr. Bennett's. The labourer's wage, therefore, went twice as far in the Roman Empire of the first century A.D. as in Delos of the third century B.C.

We conclude that Kautsky's main thesis is incorrect.

XIV

EDUARD MEYER ON THE ORIGINS OF CHRISTIANITY

MEYER'S three-volume work on the beginnings of Christianity[1] is a theological event of the first magnitude. The writer occupies a position similar to that of Mommsen a generation or more ago. Mommsen's short contributions towards theological research were eagerly studied, and are quoted still. But Meyer has written a book of over half a million words, dealing exhaustively with many of the vexed problems in New Testament study to-day. He comes to the subject with a vast knowledge of the Ancient East, as well as of Greece and Rome. His conclusions deserve the closest attention from theologians. They may feel that the limitations of the historical method prevent the truth being reached by that method only, but within the limitations of the method no such acute observer as Eduard Meyer is likely to arise in our generation.

I

The volumes before us are marked by repetitions and other signs of haste, and the order is that in which the problems successively presented themselves to the mind of the writer rather than the logical order. He begins with Acts. This leads him back to St. Luke, St. Luke to St. Mark and its sources, which are discussed in the first volume. Finding himself among the first disciples, in order to explain their state of mind he traces the development of Judaism from the beginning of Persian rule to the opening of our era. This occupies the second volume, which ends with a brief sketch of the life of

[1] *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, vols. i. and ii., 1921; vol. iii., 1923. (Berlin: Cotta.) This review is included because at the time of writing no English translation of Meyer has been announced.

Christ. In the third volume he studies the second half of Acts, from which firm ground he explores the uncertainties of the first half; then, still ascending, he reaches the Resurrection. Finally he adopts the chronological order and discusses the development of the Church and in particular the careers of St. Peter and St. Paul. The method can easily be criticized, but it has many advantages, not the least of which is that the reader is impressed by the thoroughness of modern historical research. Not till half-way through the third volume are foundations sufficiently laid to enable building to begin. We all have our limitations, and readers will at once suspect Meyer's when he avows that he has prepared himself for his task by reading the German theology of the last ten years, confident that whatever is valuable in previous discussion has found its way into these latest books (and, presumably, that English, French, and American writers can be safely neglected.)

II

However, this preoccupation with radical German criticism has had the satisfactory result of producing a healthy reaction. Meyer is continually exclaiming against the arbitrary methods of theologians, which cannot commend themselves to a historian. St. Luke, for instance, is in Meyer's eyes a historian, to be treated with the same respect as Polybius or Livy. His statements must be carefully examined, but, unless there is good reason to the contrary, we must accept them, as we should those of any other historian. The contrary procedure is ridiculous. So the Areopagus speech in Acts xvii. is a genuine report of Paul's speech at Athens. That the style is completely different from that of the Epistles does not matter. They are all addressed to believers; this is an example of how Paul preached to educated Gentiles. Just before the War, E. Norden made a sensation by his brilliant *Agnostos Theos*, which maintained that the speech was a favourite literary motif lifted by the author of Acts from other surroundings. Meyer has now brought Norden round to his view after many conversations, so that *Agnostos Theos* can now be neglected except as a storehouse of illustrative matter (iii. 92 *f.*). The visit to

Jerusalem in Acts xviii. 22 ("And when he had landed at Cæsarea, he went up and saluted the Church, and went down to Antioch") is widely rejected. Either the whole journey is doubted or the Church is explained to be the Church of Cæsarea. But no historical fact is safe if this is allowed to pass without protest. Such arguments make discussion impossible (iii. 40).

A test case is Acts xxvii. 9-11, which verses Preuschen, Wellhausen, Wendland, and many others agree to strike out as an interpolation. They can be omitted without spoiling the narrative, and Paul's prophecy is suspicious. But, as Meyer says, on such principles every historical work can be declared worthless.[1] As if prophecy were not an every-day occurrence, and people were not always trusting to instinct rather than reason! We shall see later that Meyer himself is far more sceptical than is necessary, but for this protest against German methods (which English scholars have been making all the time) we are grateful. It is interesting to learn that part of Meyer's preparation for this work was a study of the founding and development of a living religion in our own times—namely, Mormonism.

III

Meyer's treatment of St. Mark is most ingenious and interesting. This earliest Gospel was written after the Neronian persecution, and is a working over in Greek of the early Aramaic tales. Collections of the Lord's sayings and descriptions of His doings were made from the beginning. They were necessitated by the mission work which was at once inaugurated in Judæa and Galilee, and is reflected in the Instructions to the Twelve and the Seventy. St. Paul "received" these traditions at his conversion as authoritative records (*cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 25, etc.).[2] Mark therefore had a number of sources at his disposal, which can, without much difficulty, be distinguished.

[1] On similar grounds the details of the siege of Platæa in Thucydides or the taking of Babylon by the Persians in Herodotus, were questioned by a now defunct race of historians (iii. 35).

[2] This position is radically different from the fashionable view, according to which the early disciples, expecting the Parousia to take place immediately, wrote down nothing.

1. First we isolate ch. xiii., the Apocalypse. Ostensibly it is addressed to the four disciples, in reality the recipients are the primitive Christians (note *v.* 14, "let him that readeth understand"). In style it is markedly different from the rest of the Gospel; it is the only long discourse in St. Mark, and consists largely of Old Testament quotations, elsewhere little employed.

2. Next we note in vi. 30 to viii. 26 a number of doublets. Part of Jesus' itinerary seems to be told twice over. (This has often been noticed before. Knowing the fondness of Orientals for round numbers, we cannot but suspect that the stories of the Feeding of the 5,000 and the 4,000 refer to the same event, the number being slightly different according to two estimates.)

3. A Disciples-source can be distinguished, in which, except for Peter and, once or twice, the other leaders, those who surround Jesus are called vaguely "the disciples."

4. In another source the Twelve are frequently mentioned. We cannot follow Meyer as he picks out these two sources, but a few specimens of his criticism may be useful.

(*a*) iii. 13 *ff*. "And he goeth up into the mountain, and calleth unto him whom he himself would: and they went unto him. 14. And he appointed twelve, *whom also he named apostles*, that they might be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have authority to cast out devils. 16. *And he appointed the twelve*,[1] and Simon he surnamed Peter." No writer, certainly not a sensible writer like Mark, would have written like this if his hands were not tied by written sources, which he must work in.

(*b*) vi. 6 *ff*. Verse 14 follows 6. Herod hears of Jesus going about from place to place. Verses 7-13 are an interpolation from the Twelve-source, which recurs in 30. In 31 we see the join, and the Disciples-source is resumed.

(*c*) iv. 10-20. 13 clearly follows 10*a*, 11 and 12 being insertions from the Twelve-source. This is as plain as in the Hexateuch or in Livy. In verse 10 "his companions (*οἱ περὶ αὐτόν*) *with the twelve* asked of him the parable." *With the twelve* is unnecessary here, and is taken from the same source

[1] The *italicized* clauses are relegated to the footnotes in R.V., in spite of their occurrence in ℵ and B.

as 11 and 12. This solution, by the way, removes the well-known difficulty of these words, which completely contradict the obvious purpose of the parables—namely, to teach.

5. Finally we have Peter's reminiscences, which are authentic, and are worked by Mark into the Disciples-source.

Meyer's conclusion is that Mark's Gospel is a most valuable historical record. The sources he used take us right back into the earliest days.

Similar criticism is applied to Matthew and Luke, but we cannot summarize it here. An important contention is that Q and Mark are both sections of the same tradition; neither is dependent on the other. The various sources are arranged in the following order:

1 (oldest of all). The Peter reminiscences and the Disciples-source. This already incorporated different versions of the same events.

2. The Twelve-source, which took shape in Jerusalem after Peter had left Jerusalem.[1]

3. The special Lukan-source.

4. The Logia (Q).

5. The special Matthew-source.

6. Mark xiiii.

Matthew and Luke were written in the Flavian period, probably in the eighties, but their main sources were much earlier. Mark xiii. dates from 60 or a little later.

IV

The first 419 pages of the second volume describe the development of the state of things into which Jesus was born. This sketch of 300 years of Jewish history is of quite extraordinary value. Meyer views unsympathetically the triumph of fanaticism in the Maccabæan wars, and certainly it prepared the way for the catastrophe of A.D. 70. A brief life of Jesus concludes this volume. He was a native of Galilee—that is to say, a district devoted to the law, where Pharisaism ruled supreme. His conception of the world was Pharisaic, as regards the Kingdom of God, the spirit world of good angels

[1] See below for Meyer's account of the Twelve.

and demons, the Resurrection, and the coming Judgment. With the Pharisees He believed that the kingdom would introduce blessings for all nations, as indeed the prophets had taught. But His inner attitude to the Law, and His conception of the soul's relation to God, were completely different from theirs.

Jesus was not the Founder of Christianity regarded as a new religion. The ascended Christ may be called the Founder, but not Jesus of Nazareth. He was the fulfiller of the promises and the law, the divine teacher, the bringer-out of the meaning enshrined in God's revelation from the beginning—and in this sense the Messiah. The popular idea of the Messiah was in His eyes Satanic (Mark viii. 33). He was not the Son of David (Mark xii. 17)—by His "render to Cæsar," etc., He transcended national religion. Rather He was the Danielic Son of Man. Christianity was founded on the conviction that Jesus was on the right hand of God, and would come again as world-regent. But did He Himself hold this belief? Why not? asks Meyer, pointing out that modern prepossessions have led scholars astray in their judgment of Jesus.

Lastly, Jesus held Himself to be the Son of God, not in any metaphysical sense, but in virtue of His inner unity with God and utter devotion to His will. And this Jesus left such an impression on His followers as gave them no peace till they set out to win the world.

V

We now come to Meyer's refreshingly conservative study of Acts. He agrees with most recent writers in making the prologue to the Gospel cover both parts of the joint work. Theophilus is an educated Christian, to whom the book is dedicated after the current literary fashion. It is intended for the Christian community, and the dedication shows that it was formally published. Meyer has scant mercy for such aberrations as that of Blass and Zahn, who suppose two editions of the Lukan writings, one of which is represented by the Western Text (i. 1-9).[1] In writing his book Luke was in-

[1] What follows is derived from vol. iii.

fluenced by stylistic considerations, but so are modern historians. The Septuagint is far the most potent of his literary models. He writes history in the style of the popular tale, much as Herodotus does.

Unfortunately the two parts of his book have been rudely sundered. The clumsy interpolation at the beginning of Acts is an attempt to remedy the loss of the first part.[1] No other interpolations can be proved. Indeed, the absence of additions in ch. xxviii. recounting Paul's death is strong evidence that the book has come down to us practically as it left Luke's pen. A striking example, showing that the Gospel and the Acts form one book in two parts, is provided by Luke xxiv., where in defiance of tradition the writer has brought all the Resurrection appearances to Jerusalem in order to prepare for Acts i. Like all other historians, Luke has unexplained silences; certain things are omitted merely because the historian thinks they are not necessary to explain the course of events.

Luke joined Paul at Troas (Acts xvi. 10) and remained at Philippi, where he was picked up on the last journey to Jerusalem (xx. 5).[2] From the source point of view the whole of Acts falls into two parts: (*a*) xvi. 6-21, xx. 4 to xxviii. 31, which are all " we-sections," derived from personal observation, and (*b*) all the rest, for which Luke was dependent on investigation.

The origin of (*b*) is a comparatively simple problem. The stories, in so far as they are not derived from Paul himself, concern Peter, Barnabas, John, Mark, Stephen, and Philip. Mark, whom he knew in Rome (Col. iv. 10, 14), told him about Peter, to whom he had been interpreter; about Barnabas his cousin; and about the affairs of the Church at Jerusalem, which had largely centred round his mother's house. In the person of Mark the divisions between Petrine and Pauline conceptions of the Gospel were healed, so Luke's tendency to minimize differences is explained. The stories about Philip came from his own lips at Cæsarea (xxi. 8). The Stephen story is quite different from the rest, and with various details was gathered

[1] A similar explanation will account for the textual phenomena of Luke xxiv.

[2] No simple student could miss this, but learned writers have resorted to every imaginable shift to avoid the obvious.

by Luke in Palestine. But the story of Pentecost in its present form is due to Luke himself. It was written down at a time when the Glossolalia of the original tale had become unintelligible to the Christian public and a different treatment was necessary. The sources being so satisfactorily accounted for, the historical value of the records ranks accordingly high. The famine foretold by Agabus is historical. Luke's account of the death of Herod is " at least as trustworthy as that of Josephus " (iii. 168). The account of Philip's experiences strikes some as legendary, but this is how Philip remembered them twenty-five years later, and with all honesty told Luke. The purpose of the Simon Magus story is to show how the Simonians, a dangerous rival to the Church when Luke wrote, were overcome in the person of their founder. The Apostolic Council is accurately described in Acts xv. Galatians ii. refers to the same events, but is an *ex parte* statement written ten years later in great excitement to readers who were primed with the views of Paul's opponents. The historian finds no difficulty in deciding which account to follow. On theological grounds theologians have judged that Paul must always be right. Historically considered—well, what history could be written on the basis of preferring Napoleon's ideal picture of himself to that drawn by others ?

VI

If the Acts record the Beginnings of Christianity, a still more fundamental problem lies behind them, its actual origin. Meyer's treatment of it deserves very careful study. The earliest *Credo* (the most primitive document of all, taking us back to the very beginning) is found in 1 Cor. xv. 3-5, the tradition which St. Paul received on his conversion, and may well have known even before.

" That Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried; and that he hath been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures; and that he appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve."

Here the *Credo* ended. We must draw a line somewhere in verses 3-8, for " last of all . . . he appeared to me also " cannot be part of the tradition. Verses 6 and 7 are suspicious,

because " to all the apostles " is apparently a doublet of " to the twelve." We conclude that the *Credo* ends with τοῖς δώδεκα, where the ὅτι clause also ends. The rest is St. Paul's addition.

" Then he appeared to above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain until now, but some are fallen asleep." This is an earlier tradition of the story of Pentecost. " Then he appeared to James; then to all the apostles." Visiting Jerusalem when James ruled the Church, Paul heard tell that the Lord had appeared first to James, then to the twelve or the whole body of apostles. This is a parallel story to that contained in the *Credo*, only with James's name substituted for Peter's.

The historical data are scanty. The actors in these scenes construed the events as God's supernatural working, not as material for criticism. But two fundamental facts emerge from St. Paul and the Gospels. (i.) The disciples, as opposed to the Galilæan women who stayed, fled to Galilee.[1] The early Church comforted itself by reflecting that the predictions of the Old Testament and of Jesus were fulfilled thereby. (ii.) The Church began its life at Jerusalem, where Peter and the rest had returned. The link between these two facts is the command to seek the Risen Lord in Galilee.[2]

We may reconstruct the course of events thus. The disciples fled in terror at the Crucifixion. Peter especially brooded over the recent past—his confession, the Transfiguration, his denial, all of which are historical. Then he saw Jesus again. The experience of the Transfiguration was repeated.[3] He realized that all was not at an end. The kingdom foretold in Scripture would be set up, and the Son of Man of whom Daniel wrote would return to reign. The Twelve had been promised

[1] Luke completely remodelled the tradition by locating all the appearances in Jerusalem.

[2] Mk. xvi. 8. How perplexed the tradition was is shown by the contradiction in Mark—" tell His disciples and Peter " (7), " they said nothing to any one " (8). Meyer says little about the empty tomb, but seems to regard it as the inevitable expression of a belief in the Resurrection—at least for Pharisees and Christians. Greeks would not have found it necessary (iii. 212).

[3] Meyer contrasts the clear outlines of the Transfiguration tradition with the vagueness and contradictions of the Resurrection story.

that they should be rulers in the Kingdom. (By appointing Twelve Jesus had provided for the coming kingdom and had virtually claimed to be Messiah.) Only from Jerusalem as a centre was this possible. Confirmed in their purpose by a second appearance they returned to Jerusalem. They filled the gap in their number—the Matthias story is undoubtedly historical—and began to preach. Their message was the teaching of Jesus with the added *good news* that Jesus is Messiah and Lord[1] (Acts ii. 36). Almost immediately they underwent, in company with many others,[2] a great psychical experience, a "collective hallucination" as we may call it without offence. The extraordinary conduct of the Twelve can only be explained by the overpowering influence of the personality of Jesus.

Only those who are familiar with radical criticism can appreciate the significance of Meyer's arguments. Perhaps this is as far as history can ever go with its present methods. Perhaps a detached observer during those momentous weeks, seeing only the exterior occurrences and missing their interior significance, would have described them somewhat as Meyer does. It is not the duty of a historian to bring in God at this stage and say here and now did the Almighty reveal Himself. But Meyer's reconstruction clamours for God. Without God there is no *vera causa*. We are confident that sooner or later either Meyer himself, or one trained in Meyer's school, will dare to wed theology to history, and acknowledge the supreme miracle of world-history.

VII

The next section, dealing with the growth of the community at Jerusalem, must be hurried over. The moment Jesus was acknowledged as Messiah and coming world-ruler, then all the

[1] Jesus was *Maran* (κύριος) from the first. The whole of Bousset's argument in *Kyrios Christos*, that the title "Lord" grew up in the "primitive Gentile-Christian Community" of Antioch ("which never existed"), is dismissed as perverse and erroneous. Prof. Lake's reconstruction of primitive Christianity is also largely based on this assumed Antiochian stage, which is pure speculation; there is no evidence.

[2] *Cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 6.

ideas which had developed in Judaism since Daniel were transferred to Him. He was Son of Man, Son of God, Saviour. Theology was as yet in the future; there was no logical thinking out of the relations of Father and Son, and it was left to St. Paul to assign pre-existence and a share in Creation to Christ.[1] The solemn evening meals eaten with Jesus were continued. They took on an eschatological significance and became cult-acts, in accordance with the widespread conception of holy meals as establishing communion with one another and with God. Baptism, fasting, and formal prayers, all taken over from the Baptist's disciples (*cf.* Luke xi. 1), are presupposed. There is no hard and fast organization, but the Church follows lines at once hierarchical and representative: hierarchical, for the Twelve are on one side as rulers of the coming kingdom; representative, for over against them is the assembly of Christians, from whom are chosen *elders* as councillors and *deacons* to serve in things spiritual as well as material.

In other words, Meyer repeats what is practically a consensus of contemporary Continental scholarship, that the Church was Catholic from the first.

VIII

Perhaps the most notable part of the book is the treatment of the relations of SS. Peter and Paul. We can only give a brief summary of the brilliant account of St. Paul. Here again Meyer protests against current theories. Paul was essentially a Jew with a tincture of Greek culture. Resemblances in his Epistles to the Stoics or the Cynic preachers are quite external, due to the common human needs of a generation which had reached the same stage of civilization. In no sense did Hellenism enter the Church with Paul. The Greeks and he were poles apart. For the Greek wise man morality was a task, for Paul it was a gift from God. The Greek aimed at a dignified philosophy, independence, and freedom in this life;

[1] Perhaps so, but his expositions were accepted by the Church as true. All his words and actions were closely watched. What a chance he would have offered to his opponents if his doctrines had been innovations!

for the Christian happiness lies in the *Jenseits*.[1] Greek philosophy was a movement from above, an emancipation from popular religions. Christianity, historically considered, came from below. It lived in an unphilosophical world of miracle, magic, and demonology. It was one of the new religions of the imperial period, and represents "the reaction of the lower classes and the East against the dominion of the educated and against Hellenism" (iii. 328). As to the mystery religions, they moved on lines parallel to Christianity, and were much influenced by it; the Christian σωτηρία has its roots not in Hellenism, but in the Old Testament.

Meyer believes that the split at Antioch between Peter and Paul was not bridged in their lifetime. The Judaizers of Galatians maintained that Jesus was the Jewish Messiah, come not to take away, but to fulfil the law. The Gospel was for all, but they must enter the new Israel by circumcision. Paul's claim to authority was fallacious, for he had learned all from the older disciples. The leader of this movement must have been Peter. The fierceness of Paul's attack in Galatians suggests this, and it is hard to explain the quick change of the Galatian converts except by the influence of Peter, the rock. The influence of James and the Jerusalem hotheads will have impelled Peter to this course.[2] The controversy continued to the end. "How it can have been doubted that Peter came to Corinth in person is one of those things which are incomprehensible to me" (iii. 441). He stands in 1 Cor. i. 12, iii. 22, on precisely the same footing as Paul and Apollos. To whom can the ὑπερλίαν apostles of 2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11 refer unless to Peter? In 2 Corinthians the fight is very bitter. Luke, writing after the Neronian persecution, covers it up, but to make Peter disapppear after Acts xii. is the only way of doing it.

The Roman Church was probably founded in A.D. 49. The disturbances mentioned by Suetonius were caused by the

[1] But did not the Fourth Gospel with its doctrine of eternal life reconcile the two conceptions?

[2] I have not noticed that Meyer makes the point, but Peter's justification is clear. He would have looked upon uncircumcised Gentile Christians as an outer fringe corresponding to the "God-fearers" who surrounded the synagogues.

introduction of the Gospel.[1] The founders were Jewish Christians who followed the lead of James and Peter. Paul writes to a Jewish church (Rom. vii. 1) with a Gentile fringe (see i. 16, ii. 9, 10). The Epistle is a diplomatic masterpiece. Notice the way in which he introduces the Spanish journey, to show that he will be merely passing through Rome—he has no wish to intrude on another man's ground. But in ch. xvi. (which is, of course, authentic) he proves that he has many friends and adherents there. In Acts xxviii. Luke brings Paul to Rome. He arrived in the spring of 62,[2] and was executed in the persecution of 64. Peter, being too old to make sport of, was crucified. Paul, as a Roman citizen, was put to death with the sword. The crime of which both were guilty was "the name." The Government, after careful investigation, came to the conclusion that the Christians were distinct from the Jews, and an unlawful association. From Phil. i. 15-20 we learn that the oppositions which Paul had tried to bridge were still there, even increased by his presence. Christians were not living in harmless simplicity; rather they were a revolutionary force which disturbed the capital. The breach is still more evident in Col. iv. 10. Three only of those to whom Paul wrote in Romans are on his side. One of these was Mark. If Mark was in Rome, then Peter was there too. "To reject the witness of Papias is purely arbitrary. In the case of a Greek writer it would have occurred to no one to doubt it" (iii. 497). When and how Peter came there is no evidence to show. In all probability he was there when Paul arrived.

The Judaizers were fighting a forlorn hope. Mark's defection was the precursor of many others. When the storm was over he reconciled the two parties. The martyrdom of the leaders stilled this particular controversy, but Paulinism won. The decisive blow was the execution of James in 62. His successor, Simeon son of Clopas, had no authority for Gentile Christians.

We cannot discuss Meyer's argument here, but one remark suggests itself. Party feeling in Rome was clearly very strong,

[1] *Claud.* 25. Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit; *cf.* Acts xviii. 2.

[2] The Chronology of the N.T. is very carefully worked out

but St. Paul does not mention St. Peter in the Captivity Epistles. He has no hesitation in naming him in Galatians, and in writing Philippians he is equally moved. Does not this suggest that St. Peter was occupying a mediating position, mistrusted by the hotheads on both sides, but that St. Paul scrupulously refrains from identifying him with those who probably used his name ?

IX

Much has been left out in this rapid sketch, but enough has been said, I hope, to induce some readers to buy the books. In conclusion, I should like to mention some very important remarks, which, coming from an author so qualified to make them, deserve careful attention.

After the frightful misgovernment of the Roman republic the Empire gave order and security again. But it was of a material kind, and benefited the well-to-do ; the masses profited little or nothing. They were prepared for Christianity by the form which Hellenistic and Roman civilization had reached. " We are not concerned with the Hellenization of the new religion which had emerged from Judaism, but with the progressive Orientalizing of the whole civilization which had grown out of the soil of Greek culture " (iii. 334). Philosophy responded to the spirit of the age and in Neoplatonism became a mystic-theosophist movement. The final result was that the ancient world, which formerly left the individual conscience to itself so long as the protecting deities of the city were acknowledged, now became a Church demanding belief from all. Most important of all, the educated classes lost the leadership, and the non-rational and instinctive ideas of the masses prevailed. In this judgment we hear an echo of the great controversy which has been raging in Germany round Spengler's *Downfall of the West*. Some observers see a beginning of the same process in the social tendencies of to-day. Looking back on the developments so vividly described by Meyer, as Christians and humanists we are not concerned to maintain that the early Church saved for posterity all that could be saved of educated classical antiquity.

XV

ST. PAUL'S CONVERSION AND THE BEGINNINGS OF GENTILE CHRISTIANITY

IT is now generally recognized that St. Paul on his conversion came into a stream of Gentile Christianity. The Church of Antioch was from the first predominantly Gentile; see Acts xi. 20, if we read " the Greeks," and Gal. ii. 12, where the Judaizing view is represented as an innovation. It may be suspected that much the same was true of Damascus, in spite of the silence of the Acts. Although the general tendency of recent criticism is in favour of the historical value of the Acts, it cannot be denied that the author has constructed his work in accordance with a scheme by which Jerusalem is the " capital " of the Church—a scheme which, though true, may not be the whole truth. St. Luke locates all the Resurrection appearances in or around Jerusalem. If he omits the Appearances in Galilee, he may also have omitted to tell facts about the Galilæan origins of the Church which, had they survived, would have altered our account of the origins of Gentile Christianity.

From time to time scholars attempt to fill in the blanks in our knowledge. In 1921 R. Schütz published his *Apostel und Jünger*, in which he constructed an imposing edifice of a Gentile Christianity expanding northwards from Galilee. Unfortunately it is founded on a source-criticism of the Acts which has no chance of being generally accepted—an " apostles " source of Jewish, a " disciples " of Galilæan, origin.[1] Similarly V. Macmunn in *Neglected Galilee* (1922) imagined a society of Galilæans gathered into a Church during Our Lord's Ministry, developing from the first independently of Jerusalem. Bossuet's reconstruction of the Antiochian pre-Pauline phase of Christianity in *Kyrios Christus* is well

[1] So E. Meyer finds an " apostles " or " The Twelve " source and a " disciples " source in St. Mark; see p. 121.

known. Kundsin[1] in John ii. and vi. finds records of the early Galilæan Church. All these books contain so much reading between the lines that the highest praise we can give them is the adjective "suggestive."

Dr. E. Barnikol in a study of St. Paul's autobiographical testimony in Galatians (*Die vorchristliche und frühchristliche Zeit des Paulus*, Kiel, 1929) succeeds in throwing a little new light on an obscure subject. He insists that Galatians must be studied alone, without any complications that may arise from a comparison with the Acts. First, he studies v. 11: "But I, brethren, if I still preach circumcision, why am I still persecuted?" This cannot refer to the circumcising of Timothy, who as a Jew on his mother's side could be claimed as a Jew. It therefore refers to Paul's work before conversion as a Jewish missionary. The distinguishing mark between Jewish and Christian mission work is that the latter involves persecution, the former does not. We may assume that the apostle's hatred of Christianity began when he found it, that is the Gentile mission, interfering with his Jewish propaganda. Indeed a kind of reformed Judaism that did not insist on circumcision or on observance of the food laws would start with a great advantage as compared with Pharisaic Judaism. Returning to the narrative of chapter i., Dr. Barnikol reverts to an interpretation of *v.* 16 put forward long ago by Jerome. "When it was the good pleasure of God . . . to reveal his Son in me that I should preach him among the Gentiles *immediately*, I conferred not . . ."; that I should begin propaganda of Jesus as Messiah among the Gentiles, *and that immediately*. His Gentile mission was to continue, but with a new objective. But the scene of his activity was the same, namely Arabia-Damascus. "I went to Arabia and returned to Damascus" (17*b*). This is a very clever simplification. Just as ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν in iv. 9 merely means "return," so here πάλιν ὑπέστρεψα means "I returned." Damascus, that is, was the centre of Paul's Jewish missionary activity. But Damascus was then part of Arabia (Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* lxxviii. 10; *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 32), so the two statements in effect say the same thing. The statement of 22 must always be

[1] See p. 95.

difficult to reconcile with that of Acts viii. 3, ix. 1, from which we learn that Saul led a bitter persecution in Jerusalem, for how in that case could he have said to the Galatians: "I was still unknown to the churches of Judæa which were in Christ"? Taken in conjunction with the private visit to Jerusalem of 18, 19, this must include the church of Jerusalem. Even if it does not, the churches of Judæa were largely composed of refugees from Jerusalem (Acts viii. 1). However, it is no part of Dr. Barnikol's plan to discuss the Acts, much less to reconcile it with Galatians. To complete his theory he only needs to point out the meaning of 21-23. After the private visit to Jerusalem "I came unto the regions of Syria and Cilicia"—Syria being all the region North of Palestine proper, not merely Damascus and its surrounding territory. "I was still unknown by face unto the churches of Judæa which were in Christ: but they only heard say, He that once persecuted us now preacheth the faith of which he once made havoc." The subject of "say" is the Christians of the North, primarily the region of Damascus.

If this reinterpretation holds good, then we must envisage a Gentile-Christian movement North of Palestine proceeding *pari passu* with the Jewish propaganda of Saul of Tarsus. His exceptional rancour against the Christians will then have been due to the fact that they appeared in his eyes renegade Jews, playing fast and loose with the Law of God.

We now turn to the Acts and, neglecting the difficulty about St. Paul's being unknown to the churches of Judæa, try to see if we can find any hints as to the origins of Gentile Christianity. We shall be content with hints, just as we are content with the hints of Acts xviii. 24, xix. 1-7 in regard to the origin of Christianity at Alexandria and Ephesus, taking them as evidence that there were other currents besides the main stream described by St. Luke.

The earliest Christian community at Jerusalem was probably in the eyes of the authorities a kind of synagogue of Galilæans who worshipped in the temple and were united by belief in the approaching Parousia. Though it seemed necessary to take certain police measures against them, they were not seriously interfered with, and they stood high in popular

favour. Their latent tendencies in regard to the Law first became manifest in connection with St. Stephen's movement. The persecution discriminated between the apostles, who were left alone, and the Hellenists (viii. 2, 4). Missionary propaganda was conducted from the first upon lines that were unfriendly to legalism. By ix. 31 the Church is established in Galilee, a solitary reference which may or may not be significant. When St. Paul reaches Jerusalem in chap. xxi., he is told: "Thou seest how many thousands there are among the Jews of them which have believed; and they are all zealous for the law" (20). A great change has taken place in the Mother Church, which is now strongly Pharisaic. It looks as if the defeat of St. Stephen's Hellenistic movement and the scattering of those that sympathized with it made the Church of Jerusalem far more congenial to those of Pharisaic tendencies. The exact time at which they joined the Church cannot be discovered from Acts, but St. Paul in Galatians clearly shows the change in the Mother Church. At or soon after the time of his first visit to Jerusalem "the Churches of Judæa . . . glorified God" in him (i. 22, 24). His later visit was a very different affair. The implications of the Gentile mission were fully understood and most distasteful to the dominant party. The principles on which St. Paul worked had to be explained privately to the leaders and their support had to be secured in advance. "The false brethren privily brought in, who crept in (*παρεισῆλθον*) to spy out our liberty in Christ Jesus" (ii. 4), I take to be the Pharisees who had joined the Church since the first visit. Nothing had happened in their experience of Christianity to modify the bitterness they felt towards the renegade Pharisee.

The evidence is very slight, but it is cumulative and goes to show that outside Jerusalem Christianity from the first held loosely to the obligations of the law. That the original Galilæan followers of Jesus who did not settle in Jerusalem with the Twelve played a part in the development of Gentile Christianity is an attractive hypothesis; more than that we cannot say.

XVI

WAS ST. PAUL A STAMMERER?

A NEW discussion of St. Paul's "thorn in the flesh" may seem superfluous, but there is room for speculation because no theory holds the field.

1. Sir William Ramsay's idea that Paul was attacked by malaria at Perga and went for his health's sake to the highlands has little in its favour. He was a native of Tarsus, and must have known other methods of treating fever than that of plunging into the heart of the bandit-infested mountains; and how would a convalescent from malaria be "a temptation in the flesh" to the Galatians (Gal. iv. 14)?

2. Epilepsy has been surmised from the "spat out" of Gal. iv. 14 (R.V. marg.), which is said to refer to the custom of spitting to avert a demonic attack. The Galatians did not do what might have been anticipated. But there is no need to insist on the literal sense, and, even if it is allowed to stand, other inflictions besides epilepsy were ascribed to demons.

3. Ophthalmia is unlikely, in view of the keen glances of the Apostle frequently referred to.

4. Skin trouble, such as erysipelas, would certainly have been unsightly, but otherwise does not fit the evidence particularly well.

5. The earliest tradition, given by Tertullian, is headache. This, again, does not explain Gal. iv. 14, but I believe it puts us on the right track.

I suggest that St. Paul was a victim to nerves, and that modern men are peculiarly fitted to enter into his experience. Splitting headaches may well have accompanied the attacks, and they could hardly be described more appropriately than by the word *σκόλοψ*, a stake driven into his head. Read 2 Corinthians and you see at once that the writer was a mass of nerves, acutely sensitive and a prey to melancholy and depression, which came as the ebb-tide of the mighty incoming

tide of exaltation which was the other side of his being. Such was his essential sanity that a cure would probably have been possible if he could have enjoyed a quiet life and sympathetic companionship. But that was always out of his reach. His body was shattered by the experiences described in 2 Cor. xi., "the care of all the churches" was a terrible mental strain, and the psychic and spiritual side of his life made great demands on his weakened frame. Once his nerves began to go, the conditions of recovery were absent.

But some outward manifestation must be sought, such as at times limited his appeal severely. I suggest that, at least at times of exceptional strain, he suffered from inability to express himself clearly, partial aphasia, or, to use one word, a stammer. To test this, let us look at Lightfoot's list of conditions which any theory must satisfy (*Commentary on Galatians*, 186 *ff.*).

1. Physical pain of a very acute kind.

2. The malady was very humiliating, a set-off against his spiritual privileges and a check to his spiritual pride.

3. It was a grievous hindrance to the gospel and a powerful testimony to it when overcome.

4. The affliction seems to have attacked him when he preached, exposing him to possible contempt.

5. The meanness of his personal appearance may be connected with it.

6. The trouble was recurring.

Of these factors, all except 5 are admirably satisfied by the combination of headache and stammering as accompaniments of shattered nerves.

It is time to look at the passages.

(*a*) Gal. iv. 13-15: "Ye know that because of an infirmity of the flesh (δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός) I preached the gospel unto you the first time: and that which was a temptation to you in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but ye received me as an angel of God . . . ye would have plucked out your eyes and given them to me" (R.V.). "Because of an infirmity" seems to support Ramsay's theory. But we cannot now insist on the classical use of διά with the accusative, as Lightfoot did. Rom. iii. 25, viii. 20 are clear examples of the accusative used for the correct genitive, which is corrobor-

ated by non-literary evidence. The Greek Fathers are right in taking the phrase as meaning "in (or with) an infirmity of the flesh." The preaching was hindered by the Apostle's affliction. What can hinder a sermon more than a stammer? But the hearers rejected the temptation to despise the speaker. They received him with sympathy and would have done anything for him.

(*b*) 2 Cor. xii. gives fuller information. The affliction began at a definite period, fourteen years ago. St. Paul had a supreme mystic experience, which he was unable to describe. "It is not *lawful* for a man to utter" it, he says, but the words are at least consistent with the supposition that a temporary aphasia made it impossible to describe his experience. And just then came the thorn in the flesh, "a messenger of Satan to buffet me." Now anything which prevented the proclamation of the gospel could be called "a messenger of Satan" (*cf.* 1 Thess. ii. 18), and stammering suits these particular words better than anything which has been suggested so far. After all, there is a mystery about St. Paul's preaching. Reading the Acts, *e.g.* the Areopagus speech, we imagine it must have been extraordinarily effective. But in 2 Cor. x. 10 we read that the verdict was, "His letters are weighty and strong; but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech is contemptible" (ἐξουθενήμενος; *cf.* Gal. iv. 14, "the temptation that beset you in my flesh you did not contemn," ἐξουθενήσατε); and in 2 Cor. xi. 6, "though I be rude in speech" (ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ). This is generally explained by saying that St. Paul was deficient in the art of rhetoric. But the Epistles, parts of which have been recently shown to conform to the rules of "ancient artistic prose," do not suggest this any more than the Acts, and perhaps the Church of Corinth, with its "not many mighty, not many noble," would not have been very particular about the technical excellence of sermons. But a voluble Greek community would have found a preacher's stammer a stern obstacle to the acceptance of his message.

An objection must be met here. In Acts xiv. 12 Paul "was the chief speaker," and elsewhere in the book his preaching seems to have been effective. But it is a peculiarity of stammering that the sufferer is never quite sure of himself. Sometimes

he is at the top of his form and pulls off a brilliant success. The very effort he has to make to speak well produces good results on the happy occasions when inhibitions are removed. Above all, he is largely dependent on a sympathetic audience. The enthusiastic welcome at Lystra may have helped him to make one of the most effective speeches of his life, though the leader of a deputation who is "the chief speaker" is not always a *good* speaker. Conditions would have been different at Athens. This "University Sermon" may have been most trying. Does St. Luke preserve the notes of a speech for which the Apostle made a great effort but failed ignominiously? Athens was the last place to tolerate a breakdown.

We are getting very speculative here, but it is worth continuing the line of thought. Paul went on to Corinth "in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling," no longer relying on "excellency of word." This exactly describes the state of mind of a stammerer after failing to make his message effective, and it is precisely at Corinth, after this set-back, that we get evidence of his "contemptible speech." There is a passage in Colossians (iv. 2, 3) which may be taken to hint at a recurrence of the old nervous fears. "Praying for us, that God may open for us a door for the word . . . that I may make it manifest, as I ought to speak."

Lastly, let us remember that stammerers sometimes write very well. The brilliant orator feels no need to polish his sentences with great care; they come rolling off his tongue with too much ease. But the tongue-tied man, conscious that he has a message, the effectiveness of which is hindered by his limitations, takes endless trouble to express himself well on paper. Charles Lamb, Charles Kingsley, and "Lewis Carroll" are examples of stammerers who made their mark in literature. Possibly the supreme power of St. Paul's Epistles owes something to the pains taken by a tongue-tied man to say properly on paper what he had failed to say effectively in speech. We can be quite sure that 1 Cor. xiii. is a deliberate composition, polished and pruned until it became a masterpiece. If we omit it we can read xii. 31, xiv. 1 consecutively—"a still more excellent way show I unto you. Follow after love." Having written this, St. Paul reflected that here was the place to inter-

polate his prose hymn in praise of Love. This is evidence for careful writing.

Nerves—headaches—stammering. Such is the complex which I imagine to have been St. Paul's "thorn in the flesh." If the stammering is thought fanciful, I would at least plead for the nerves, and suggest that the extraordinary appeal of the Apostle to many is due in part to the closeness with which he approaches twentieth-century civilized man in this respect. Or the headaches may be omitted. "The thorn in the flesh" may be metaphorical, like the buffeting inflicted by the messenger of Satan.

XVII

THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS

THE appearance of a new commentary on Philippians in the Meyer series by the brilliant scholar E. Lohmeyer (Göttingen, 1928) is an event in New Testament scholarship. For with extraordinary skill it presents a new interpretation of a document about which all might be thought to have been said. The exegesis is protracted but not verbose. Out of many novel features we choose three: (*a*) the Cæsarean origin of the Epistle; (*b*) the conception of martyrdom that dominates the whole; and (*c*) the important new view of ii. 6-11.

(*a*) E. Meyer (*Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* iii. 482) calls the theory that i. 13, iv. 22 can refer to any place but Rome "one of the wildest aberrations of modern criticism." Though Rome remains the most likely place of writing, such a judgment is absurdly downright; the fact that the two latest writers, Prof. Michael in the Moffatt Commentaries and Lohmeyer in the Meyer series, adopt the Ephesian and Cæsarean hypotheses respectively is enough to show that there are other possibilities. Against Cæsarea the chief arguments are these:

1. The prætorian guard of i. 13 and Cæsar's household of iv. 22 point to Rome. Lohmeyer replies that there is no single instance in the *Koine* of πραιτώριον in a military sense. It is always a place—either, outside Italy, the residence of the provincial governor or, in Italy, the place where the imperial officials worked. The obvious meaning of the word is that which it bears elsewhere in the New Testament, and if in Acts xxiii. 35 we find St. Paul in prison in the prætorium at Cæsarea there is no need to seek for any other explanation of the Philippians passage. Preuschen-Bauer's Dictionary of the New Testament leaves the meaning open, and Dibelius in his Commentary traces the meaning of the word similarly to Lohmeyer. In iv. 22 "they of Cæsar's household" simply

means the imperial slaves, who were found all over the Empire. However, it remains true that a special link between imperial slaves and Philippi is more likely if the former were at Rome.

2. The situation presupposed in Philippians does not correspond to that at Philippi as revealed by the Acts. St. Paul has lately been at Philippi on his way to Rome *via* Jerusalem. His very dreams show that Rome is in his mind (xxiii. 11). Claudius Lysias rescues him from the Jews, finding nothing worthy of death in him. He is confined in honourable captivity (ἄνεσις, xxiv. 23), his friends being allowed to visit him. He has frequent conversations with Felix, and Festus declares that Paul's formal appeal to Cæsar alone stands in the way of his release. If Lohmeyer's view is accepted, that the Epistle is pervaded by an overwhelming feeling of impending martyrdom, a less promising background than Cæsarea cannot be imagined. If it is replied that Acts xxviii. 30, 31 is equally unpromising, we agree. On the other hand, 2 Cor. i. 8-11 reveals a situation at Ephesus closely resembling what Lohmeyer finds in Philippians, and his arguments might be used to support the Ephesian theory. Further, Paul is looking forward to visiting Philippi, if he is released. That is natural, if he is at Rome; improbable, if he is at Cæsarea—unless indeed some completely new situation has arisen, such as Lohmeyer describes. The positive arguments in favour of a Palestinian background of Philippians are insignificant, as Lohmeyer would discover if they were used by anyone else.

(*b*) Lohmeyer's thesis, worked out with German thoroughness, is that the thought of martyrdom dominates the whole Epistle. The Philippians are suffering persecution, so is Paul. An intense fellow-feeling is set up between him and them. The Apostle is quivering with sympathy for his beloved converts. The divisions at Philippi are between the confessors, the "perfect" of iii. 15, and the lapsed. Akin to the thought of martyrdom is that of the Parousia. "The Lord is at hand" (iv. 5)—in the throes of martyrdom the Apostle and the Philippians will go straight to Him and see Him face to face.

Now it is clear that St. Paul is facing the possibility of death, and that the Philippian Church has been experiencing trouble. It may well be that Lohmeyer is right in emphasizing

this aspect of the situation. But he has done his best to provoke the reader to a violent reaction in which the thesis may be dismissed summarily. To expect one key to fit every door of a complicated problem is not the mark of a balanced scholar. Lohmeyer presses every particle of evidence, even at times appearing to create evidence, into the service of a pre-conceived opinion. The reader can check the theory for himself by reading Philippians in English with Lohmeyer's interpretation in mind. He will probably conclude that there is something in it, but hardly that Philippians is to be read as an anticipation of the Ignatian Epistles or as a treatise *de lapsis*.

A few specimens of the exegesis of the first chapter will show the character of the book. In i. 1 the curious mention of the saints " with the bishops and deacons " shows that the leaders of the Church are absent from the general body—*i.e.* in prison. " Joy " in 4 and elsewhere in the Epistle is a technical term for the joy of martyrdom. Verse 7 shows that the Philippians, like St. Paul, experienced persecution and testimony before magistrates. " To speak the word of God " (14) is virtually " to be a confessor." " The spirit of Jesus Christ " (19) is that promised to martyrs and confessors in Mark xiii. 11. In 26 Paul hopes to come to Philippi to await the Parousia with his converts there.

(*c*) Lohmeyer's treatment of the great Christological passage repays careful study. He finds in Phil. ii. 6-11 a pre-Pauline hymn arranged in two strophes of three verses each. Each verse has a threefold division, or three lines, and each line has a triple beat, the 3 : 3 : 3 metre occasionally found in Old Testament poetry as a variant of the more usual 3 : 3 metre, or the 3 : 2 (*Qina*). To explain what follows we must set it out in full:

I.	1. ἐν μορφῇ ὑπάρχων	Being in the form of God,
	2. οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο	He considered it not a thing to be seized
	3. τὸ εἶναι ἴσα τῷ θεῷ	Equality with God;
II.	1. ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν,	But emptied himself,
	2. μορφὴν δούλου λαβών,	Taking the form of a servant,
	3. ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπου γενόμενος	Coming in human likeness;

III. 1. καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος	And having been seen on earth as Man,
2. ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν,	Humbled himself,
3. γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου,	Becoming obedient unto death,
[θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ].	[The death of the Cross].
IV. 1. διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν	Wherefore God exalted him,
2. καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα	And gave him the Name
3. τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα.	That is above every name;
V. 1. ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ	That in the name of Jesus
2. πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ	Every knee should bow,
3. ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων,	Of things in heaven, on earth, and under the earth,
VI. 1. καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται	And every tongue confess
2. ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς	" Jesus Christ is Lord,"
3. εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός.	To the glory of God the Father.

Note the orderly development of the theme. I.-III. describe the choice of the Word in heaven before the Incarnation, His coming to earth, His death, and probably the *Descensus ad Inferos*, for Death is personified as in 1 Cor. xv. 55, Apoc. xx. 13, and " things under the earth " in V. 3 recapitulates the thought of III. 3. IV.-VI. tell of the exaltation of the God-Man and His universal Lordship. The following points in the Commentary may be emphasized.

I. 2. *ἁρπαγμόν*, according to the latest research into the *Koine*, is translated as if it were *εὕρημα*—" a lucky find," almost " treasure trove."

3. " Equality with God." The reference is clearly to the Devil's temptation of Adam and Eve—" Ye shall be as gods "; Satan had previously yielded to the temptation.

II. 2. There is only one possible source for this conception of the Incarnation, namely Isaiah liii. Note also the quotation in V. 2, VI. 1 from Isa. xlv. 23.

3. " Likeness " does not differ appreciably in meaning from " form."

III. 1. *σχήματι* is hard to translate, but when applied to persons it certainly has no Docetic sense such as it bears when

applied to a thing in 1 Cor. vii. 31. εὑρεθείς nowhere else in the Greek Bible is followed by ὡς. Indeed such a usage is contrary to Greek idiom, which has simply the nominative after the passive of εὑρίσκω. Therefore ὡς goes closely with ἄνθρωπος. The two words are a translation of *K'bārĕnāsh* of Dan. vii. 13, "like unto a (the) Son of Man." Another translation, closely resembling that of the LXX, is found in Rev. i. 13 (ὅμοιον υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου) and xiv. 14 (ὅμοιον υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου).

2, 3. Death as a sign of humility is only found in Isa. liii. "The death of the Cross" is apparently the Apostle's explanatory gloss (see below).

IV.-VI. The name above every name is "Lord." The God-Man is acknowledged as supreme over the cosmos.

At this point we may deal with the objection that Lohmeyer's division of the clauses may be fanciful and subjective. Thus Dibelius, reviewing the book in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, suggests that it is arbitrary to bracket "even the death of the cross" as an interpretative gloss; is not this section one of 4 lines rather than 3? But Lohmeyer's illustration from the similar gloss in 1 Cor. xv. 56 is convincing. And we may add that if, as seems probable, Death is personified in Phil. (as in 1 Cor. xv. 55) and the *Descensus ad Inferos* is meant, then the interpretation introduces a new idea and is clearly seen not to be a part of the original hymn. More weighty is the possible objection that the whole passage can be equally well explained, as it was by J. Weiss, as a specimen of Greek rhetorical prose, the higher style to which a practised writer like St. Paul naturally rose when the occasion demanded it. The objection can be met in several ways. In what follows (*a*) is an amplification of Lohmeyer's argument, (*b*) (*c*) and (*d*) are additions to it.

(*a*) *The ideas and vocabulary are demonstrably un-Pauline*, or at least so unusual in the Pauline Epistles as to incline us to that conclusion when taken in conjunction with other factors. μορφή outside this passage occurs in the New Testament elsewhere only in the spurious ending of Mark. ὑπάρχειν ἐν is not found elsewhere in St. Paul (in 1 Cor. xi. 18 ἐν means

"among"), but occurs five times in Luke-Acts. ἴσος is un-Pauline, though the phrase "equal with God" comes in John. v. 18. κενοῦν elsewhere in Paul has an unfavourable sense. δοῦλος is used here only of Christ in the New Testament (*cf.* Isa. xlix. 3, 5). ὡς ἄνθρωπος has been already considered. ὑπερύψωσεν here only in New Testament, frequent in Daniel; we are reminded of Acts ii. 33 ὑψωθείς to the right hand of God, *cf.* v. 31 and John iii. 14, viii. 28, xii. 32, 34; *exaltation* here takes the place of the Pauline *raising from the dead*. "The Name of Jesus" does not occur elsewhere in Paul, but see Acts iv. 18, 30; nor does καταχθόνιος. A careful study of the vocabulary shows an affinity to the LXX of 2 Isaiah and Daniel and to that of the early chapters of Acts.

(*b*) *Intrinsic probability is in favour of the section's being a hymn.* The more we press the actuality of Philippians as a genuine letter, the more probable it is that St. Paul did not pause in his dictation to compose an exquisitely balanced and rhythmical piece of prose. But nothing is more probable than that he should quote a hymn, probably familiar to the Philippians, which conveyed his meaning with solemnity and appropriateness.

(*c*) *The passage can be easily translated into the form of an Aramaic poem.* The Rev. P. P. Levertoff has kindly made this translation for me (see below).

(*d*) *The supposed hymn falls into line with other New Testament hymns.* In fact we can show that the 3:3:3 form, exceptional in the Old Testament, was apparently the favourite form of the early Church. An obvious parallel is Eph. v. 14.

I. 1. Awake, thou that sleepest,
2. And arise from the dead,
3. And Christ shall shine upon thee.

More instructive is 1 Tim. iii. 16.

I. 1. Manifested in the flesh,
2. Justified in the spirit,
3. Seen of angels;

II. 1. Preached among the nations
2. Believed on in the world,
3. Received up in glory.

This and the Philippian hymn are both introduced by the relative ὅς; the first half of both poems deals with the Incarnation, the second half with the Church and the Gentile Mission; both end with "glory."

Still more striking is Luke ii. 29-32.

I. 1. Now lettest Thou Thy servant depart, O Lord,
2. According to Thy word, in peace;
3. For mine eyes have seen Thy salvation;

II. 1. Which thou hast prepared before the face of all peoples,
2. A light for revelation to the Gentiles,
3. And the glory of Thy people Israel.

Once more note that the second half of the poem deals with the Gentile mission and ends with the note of "glory."

One example out of the Odes of Solomon must suffice (No. 27).

I. 1. I stretched out my hands and sanctified my Lord:
2. For the extension of my hands is His sign:
3. And my expansion is the upright tree (or Cross).

May we not suppose that the Philippian hymn and the Nunc Dimittis have the same origin, both having been composed in Aramaic in the early Church at Jerusalem and speedily translated into Greek for the Greek-speaking members of the bilingual community? The linguistic phenomena of Phil. ii. 6-11 recall the style of the early chapters of Acts; and where else than Jerusalem was the scene of the fateful combination of Isa. liii. with Dan. vii.? If the foregoing arguments hold good, one more brick has been added to the edifice of demonstration that "Paulinism" is pre-Pauline, that the dogmatic system once supposed to have been elaborated by the Apostle was in fact inherited by him.[1]

[1] The difficulty of distinguishing between rhythmical, rhetorical Greek prose and translations from the Aramaic is considerable. Prof. Burney in *The Poetry of Our Lord* reconstructed His original poetical utterances. Other scholars have found in the same passages the κῶλα of Greek *Kunstprosa*. Three factors should be borne in mind: (*a*) Our Lord doubtless sometimes spoke in solemn prophetic (or rather gnomic) manner after the fashion of the Old Testament; (*b*) the Gospel tradition would be moulded into rhythmical form, consciously or unconsciously, to meet the needs of catechetical instruction; (*c*) the New Testament writers would, in a greater or less degree, mould traditional material, according to the canons of writing common to the whole Mediterranean area.

Note by P. P. Levertoff

The following is a transliteration of a rendering into Galilæan Aramaic of the supposed hymn:

I. 1. Bidmúto de-eláha itṓhi
2. Weḥáshba lo háwa leshalála
3. Itóhi le-péḥma de-eláha.

II. 1. Ela sárik we-hípshit et náphshe
2. Udemúta de-ábda násba
3. Be-tzílma de-ínsha itóhi ;

III. 1. Ék bar-násha ishtàkaḥ
2. We-náphshe sháphal we-mákaḥ
3. Ádma le-mótha ishtámá
(Mota de-tzeliba)

IV. 1. Al-kén agbéhe eláha
2. We-yáheb lo shéma sagiha
3. De-gebíha mikól shemáhin;

V. 1. De-bishéma de-Yeshúa
2. Tikrá kol bírka
3. De-bishemáya u-be-ára we-dele-táḥat de-ára

VI. 1. We-kól lishán nóde
2. Yeshúa mashíḥa hu mára
3. Le-shúbḥa de-eláha abúhi.

The theory works all right until V. and VI. I.-IV. are in hymn form, but V., VI. are obviously St. Paul's own application of Isa. xlv. 23 to Jesus. In VI. the beats appear to be correct, but do not possess the correct rhythm on recitation.

Additional Note

As this book was passing through the press Lohmeyer's later work (*Kyrios Jesus*, Heidelberg, 1928), which anticipates most of the additional points made above, came into my hands. The new book developes with great fulness the thesis sketched in the Commentary. A few points of exegesis may be mentioned here. "Becoming obedient unto death," an aorist participle following the main verb and denoting an action subsequent to that of the verb, is un-Greek, but well known in

Semitic languages. Death was Christ's own action—He might have avoided it as did Enoch and Elijah. " *Gave* him the name " —ἐχαρίσατο—reminds us of the apparently Adoptionist Christology found in the early chapters of Acts. " The Name " is the name *and office* of Lord; as God is Lord, so is He. He is Lord of the cosmos rather than " Our Lord," Lord of the community.

At the back of the Psalm lies a cosmogonic " myth " parallel to that of Ormuzd and Ahriman; Ahriman refused to be subject to anyone, and so created his own world—he did hold equality with God to be " treasure-trove." Some such complex of ideas was present in Judaism. The conception of the *Urmensch* (primal, archetypal man) was held, though not in any clear logical way. Isaiah liii. was interpreted in the light of this conception. Early Christianity, that is, was based on a form of Judaism which had already set itself free from nationalist trammels. The transcendental and cosmical Christ of St. Paul, especially in Colossians, is not of Hellenistic origin, but part of the Church's Jewish heritage. The Psalm will have been composed by a Greek-speaking Jew, probably at Jerusalem, and have been sung at the Eucharist. The ideas which it represents reveal to us the soil out of which both Pauline and Johannine theology grew.

Enough has been said to show the extraordinary importance of Lohmeyer's investigations. At present they cannot be considered as more than a thesis put forward for consideration by scholars. In particular, the whole conception of the *Urmensch* is shrouded in obscurity. The documents on which those who argue along these lines rely are of doubtful *provenance* and date. But the new ideas in their general tendency deserve to be treated with respectful sympathy. They are more consistent with traditional Christianity than anything we have had from Protestant Germany for a long time. It is claimed that the transcendental cosmic Christ, indeed all the mystery, wonder, and otherworldliness of our faith, descends to us from the original community at Jerusalem; that first century Palestine was the home of a rich variety of religious thought and experience, out of which the Divine Spirit fashioned the Christian faith.

It may be worth pointing out that "myth" in German theological books does not necessarily convey an invidious sense; it may stand for the necessarily symbolical clothing of conceptions which deal with matters beyond the scope of history.

XVIII

TWO PAULINE TEXTS

(*a*) 1 Cor. xiii. 13: *νυνὶ δὲ μένει πίστις, ἐλπίς, ἀγάπη· τὰ τρία ταῦτα, μείζων δὲ τούτων ἡ ἀγάπη* (Westcott-Hort's punctuation).

But now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is love.

THE apostle has been contrasting love with the other virtues, including faith and hope. Comparing faith with love he says: "If I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing." All that is of permanent value in faith and hope is included in love, which "believeth all things, hopeth all things." That he would have included hope among the things that pass away may be inferred from Rom. viii. 24—"hope that is seen is not hope." The familiar verse of a hymn sums up his line of thought:

> Faith will vanish into sight,
> Hope be emptied in delight,
> Love in heaven will shine more bright,
> Therefore give us love.

Why then does St. Paul end by saying that faith, hope, and love all abide? Even though there is no question of exact theological definition here, the change of standpoint is remarkable. Two explanations suggest themselves.

(*a*) "Now abideth" refers to the present dispensation. Faith, hope, love, are of abiding value here, but love is greatest since it lasts on into the next world. So von Harnack (quoted by Reitzenstein, *Historia Monachorum und Historia Lausiaca*, p. 101). The temporal sense of *νυνί* is as well attested in St. Paul as the logical, adversative sense. The meaning would apparently be that spiritual endowments fall into three classes: (i.) knowledge, tongues, etc., which pass away; (ii.) faith and hope, which have an abiding value in this life; (iii.) love, which

lasts for ever. Nothing in the chapter so far bears out such a tripartite division.

(*b*) We must never forget that the epistles were dictated. The thoughts underlying 1 Cor. xiii. will have often been in St. Paul's mind, and perhaps used in sermons. But when he expressed them in this classical form he was inspired and far above his usual level. Something of ecstasy, of the gift of prophesying, possessed him, and the words were spoken " at one golden time, in a gush of the spirit, when the man must have been trembling " (John Masefield of a passage in *Antony and Cleopatra*).[1] It is perverse to look for a severely logical argument in such circumstances. On the other hand, a sufficient cause must be found for the sudden change at the end of the chapter. This is given if we may suppose " faith, hope, love " to have been a phrase, familiar to speaker and readers alike, which came unasked to his lips. Instead of ending " . . . even as I am known. But now [*i.e.*, as it is] love alone *μένει* [has abiding value]," he starts with the singular verb, and then, without regard for logical consistency, introduces the familiar triad, saving the situation by adding " but [not " and " as R.V.] the greatest of these is love." Lietzmann and J. Weiss had already hinted at this solution in their commentaries, but it was left for Reitzenstein in 1916 (*op. cit.*, p. 100) to produce a parallel. Porphyry *ad Marcellam*, c. 24, says: " Let four elementary principles especially be firmly held as regards God: faith, truth, love, hope "—*τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα μάλιστα κεκρατύνθω περὶ θεοῦ· πίστις, ἀλήθεια, ἔρως, ἐλπίς.* A third-century philosopher may have been influenced by the New Testament, but it is more likely that St. Paul altered the pagan *ἔρως* with its unworthy associations to the Christian *ἀγάπη* than that Porphyry or some predecessor carried out the reverse process. If a third-century Neoplatonist had the phrase, it may have been current among Stoics at Tarsus and elsewhere in the first century. " Truth " may have been added by Porphyry to a familiar formula—it is less obviously an attitude of the soul towards God than the others, and Porphyry perhaps desired to get *four elements*. So in the British House

[1] But I think that he had dictated the passage at an earlier date and that he incorporated it as it stood in this Epistle; see p. 139.

of Commons, in February, 1923, Mr. Stanley Baldwin during the debate on the Address commended four monosyllables to his hearers—faith, hope, love, work.

Reitzenstein suggests that St. Paul had the four " elements " in his mind and struck out ἀλήθεια. " Truth " was founded on " knowledge " and therefore was unattainable in this life. The Corinthians had boasted of " knowledge," the limitations of which St. Paul set himself to expose.

(*b*) Galatians iii. 20 ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν, ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν.

Now a mediator is not a mediator of one; but God is one.

This sentence occurs in one of St. Paul's characteristic arguments, which defy the translator. Dictated for an emergency, vibrant with emotion, depending for its interpretation on many conversations never recorded which the writer had had with the recipients of the letter—the passage is almost meaningless unless the commentator paraphrases it and, by an inevitably subjective process, fills in the gaps and amplifies the allusions.

In the background are the Judaizers. Recent criticism has done justice to these men, who indeed, though the future was not to be theirs, had a strong case. They visualized the Gentile mission just as every Jewish Christian must have done at first. As the Jews welcomed Gentiles as " God-fearers," an outer ring of adherents who kept the moral law and in various ways respected the prejudices of the Jews proper, so these Christians raised no objection to the baptism of Gentiles, but held that circumcision was the entrance to a higher stage. St. Paul saw that the issue was vital. Not thus could the Gospel become a world-religion. We owe him the greatest possible gratitude for his insight and firmness, but need not accept his view of the Judaizers.

To understand verse 20 we must begin as far back as verse 15, paraphrasing freely.

Brethren, let me give you an illustration from common life.[1]

[1] " Brethren, I speak after the manner of men: Though it be but a man's covenant, yet . . ." (R.V.) cannot pass. ὅμως, " nevertheless," must connect this sentence with the preceding. The sense is

When a man's covenant or will[1] has once been validated (by the observance of all legal forms or by his death), no one can make it invalid or execute a second document affecting its contents. Now the promises were spoken to Abraham and to his seed. Note that the Scripture uses the singular. According to the accepted canons of exegesis we are justified in seeing a significance in this. The plural "seeds" would have implied a plurality, the singular points unmistakably to a single person, namely Christ. (You remember what the promise was in Gen. xxii. 18. "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth—*πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* LXX—be blessed." The promise has been fulfilled in our experience. You Gentiles have entered the Church and are already *in Christ*. That means Christ, the seed foretold, is entering upon His inheritance as the Gentile mission progresses, and you in Him are fellow-heirs.)[2] I mean this. A covenant already ratified by God the law which came 430 years later cannot invalidate, to make the promise void. The inheritance of which God told Abraham (that inheritance into which you *in Christ* are now entering) must be either conditioned by obedience to the Law, or else a fulfilment of God's promise. It cannot be both. (If, as the Judaizers assert, keeping the law is necessary, then God's promise is valueless.) But God's gift to Abraham (and by implication to his seed) *was* by promise, nothing was said about keeping the Law. What *is* this Law? It was a subsequent addition in the divine economy, added to produce sins[3] (to increase the number of sins which a good man has to guard against and prove the hopelessness of getting salvation by the

not that required. Probably it should be accentuated ὁμῶς (as in 1 Cor. xiv. 7) with Blass. The meaning is "in the same way"; it introduces the illustration, but can be omitted in English where juxtaposition of the clauses is sufficient.

[1] διαθήκη in the papyri = "will." There is no need to tie down the meaning here to one or the other. The will is the outstanding example of a covenant.

[2] This passage in brackets seems to me an essential part of the argument. St. Paul will have preached along these lines and the reference to Gen. xxii. 18 was sufficient to recall his teaching.

[3] τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν. *Cf.* Rom. v. 20 "the Law came in beside, that the trespass might abound." R.V. "because of transgressions" suggests that the Law was a remedy for sin, an impossible idea in the light of Romans.

Pharisaic Halachah, or way of legality). It was a temporary provision intended to last until Christ came, the seed in whom the promise should come true. And whereas the promise was given directly by God, the law came through angels, through their representative Moses. God is one and needs no representative, but a crowd of angels had to choose some one as their spokesman. In thus pointing out the secondary position of the Law, we do not of course imply that it was in any way contrary to the promise.

If the above interpretation is correct, there is no contrast between a human and a divine covenant, as R.V. implies. Two covenants are contrasted in iv. 24, but they need not be imported into the present passage. The contrast is only between promise and Law. The promise is permanent, for it is fulfilled in the Gospel; the Law is transitory. The promise was given by God: the Law by angels. The promise was given directly: the Law by a mediator. Dr. Peake inclines to this interpretation, though he says the passage is exceedingly difficult and verse 20 may be a gloss. "No confidence can be felt in any interpretation."

What part were the angels thought to have played on Sinai? Except for one passage in Josephus there is no first-century evidence outside the New Testament for their supposed giving of the Law. I suggest that Heb. ii. 2, "the word spoken through angels," is derived from Gal. iii. 19, and that St. Paul's expression is derived from Stephen's speech in Acts vii. If St. Luke sometives gives us speeches composed in the Thucydidean manner, it is agreed on all sides that Stephen's speech contains very primitive elements.[1] St. Paul heard it at a crisis in his life shortly before his conversion. The concluding words "by the ordinances of angels"[2] may well have lodged in his mind and borne fruit in later years. We may imagine him during the years when he was thinking out his gospel brooding over the mystery of the law, good and holy and yet

[1] Dr. Abrahams in his second series of *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospel* (1924) supports this view. Except for the conclusion, the speech he says is thoroughly Hebraic.

[2] εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων = ἐν διαταγαῖς ἀγγέλων.

such an obstacle in the way of the acceptance of the gospel by the Gentiles. At last he gets a clue. The Law is secondary. Spirits interested in human affairs have intervened and dictated all these ordinances—touch not, taste not, handle not. God has *allowed* their intervention only. But these angels, so he teaches in Colossians, are themselves the objects of Christ's reconciling work (i. 20); the divine pleroma dwells in them (ii. 9) and is not, as Philo taught, divided among the angelic powers; the worshipping of angels (ii. 18) is a kind of Judaizing connected with the legalism mentioned in ii. 16, 17.

Philo's doctrine of the angels aptly illustrates what we have said. I quote from Dr. Drummond (*Philo*, ii. 144). "Those whom other philosophers called demons, Moses was accustomed to call angels. Now, they are souls flying in the air, some of whom descend into bodies; 'but others did not think fit ever to be united with any of the parts of the earth, whom, being consecrated and taking charge of the service of the Father, the Fabricator is accustomed to use as assistants and ministers for the care of mortals.' Souls and demons and angels are then different names for one and the same subject." "The sun, moon and stars form an ethereal host more remote from man, while the angels are an aerial army, nearer to the earth and more interested in human affairs."

I see one objection to the view here upheld. In what sense was Moses a mediator when he received the law and Abraham not one when he received the promise? Moses, I would answer, was a mediator between a host of angels on the one side and the nation of Israel on the other. God spoke to Abraham directly, and the patriarch was at that time the entire nation (*cf.* Heb. vii. 10).

I think "mediator" must refer to Moses in the light of *The Assumption of Moses* (i. 14). "And so He planned and ordained me, who before of old was prepared to be the mediator of His covenant." Otherwise I should propose to base the Galatians passage to a still further extent on Stephen's speech. In Acts vii. 38 Stephen speaks of the angel which spoke to Moses on Mount Sinai, in vii. 53 of the angels who ordained the law. May not the angels of Gal. iii. 19 be the angels of Acts vii. 53 and the mediator the single angel of Acts vii. 38?

XIX

"DIE HAUSTAFELN"

DIE HAUSTAFELN[1] is a title so hard to translate into English that we had better retain it as a technical term. Though it goes back to the section-headings of Luther's Bible, it is not given in Flügel-Schmidt-Tanger's Dictionary. In the ancient world, by the side of the public State morality appearing, for example, in the Twelve Tables of ancient Rome, there was a code of private, domestic morality which the Germans call "House-Tables," dealing with the duties of husbands and wives, parents and children, masters and slaves, or, by an extension, with those of different classes in a community towards one another. The thesis is that certain sections of the New Testament reproduce the stock exhortations (*paraenesis*) setting forth this code. In an extreme form it was stated in 1903 by Seeberg, who found in the Epistles many stock phrases of catechetical instruction. Our present subject concerns a few clearly defined passages only, which were first put in this light by Dibelius, whose thesis is now worked out by Herr Weidinger in a competent monograph. The special importance of the theory in New Testament exegesis is this: if it holds good, then we cannot draw any conclusions as to the conditions of the various Churches addressed in the Epistles from the passages in question. At the same time the discussion throws a welcome light on the problems of first-century Christianity.

The earliest attempt to grapple with the moral problems of the young Church appears in 1 Corinthians and is conditioned by St. Paul's eschatology. Especially in ch. vii., dealing with marriage problems, we see that questions are answered in one way rather than another because the apostle believes in the imminent end of the age. Now suppose a missionary at a somewhat later period, when the eschatological hope was begin-

[1] By K. Weidinger: Leipzig, 1928.

ning to recede, without St. Paul's genius, confronted with ethical problems—what can he do but adopt and adapt the best morality of the period? This, it is claimed, is what St. Paul himself did a few years later, and *a fortiori* other teachers. Their main source was Hellenistic Judaism, that is to say Judaism uprooted from the soil of Palestine, finding most of the ceremonial law impossible and emphasizing a high morality. Such Jewish ethical teaching is hard to reconstruct, for Sirach, etc., are a *literary* redaction of it, and the popular synagogue instruction is lost. Probably Tobit iv. and xii. are the best early examples of stock moral exhortation, there embedded in the framework of a narrative. But parts of the Ahikar-saga, pseudo-Phocylides, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and Philo also provide useful material. To them, as our sources, we must add the Hellenistic material of pagan moralists; also, for the first Christians, such Words of the Lord Jesus as were applicable. The records of pagan ethics are, like the Jewish, largely literary, and some allowance must be made for this factor. There is no reason to suspect any important change in pagan ideals during the first three centuries, so we may draw upon later writers to illustrate the New Testament books. The point then is that there was a body of unwritten morality, part of which found literary expression, generally accepted in the Mediterranean world which the early Church took over. The two clearest references to it are Sophocles' *Antigone* 454 *f.*, where Antigone insists on obeying the ἄγραπτα κἀσφαλῆ θεῶν νόμιμα rather than Creon's orders, and Xenophon's *Memorabilia* iv. 4, 19-24, where Socrates and Hippias discuss νόμιμα ἄγραφα. The fundamental precepts were to fear the gods, honour parents, bury the dead, love one's friends, be faithful to one's country. It is to them that St. Paul refers in Romans ii. 14—"Gentiles which have no law do by nature the things of the law." Here he recognizes the substantial identity of Jewish and Greek morality and thereby sanctions the taking over of the *Haustafeln*.

Let us now look at some of the New Testament passages.

(*a*) Col. iii. 18 *ff*. There is nothing specifically Christian in these verses, any more than in Phil. iv. 8; a Stoic could have

written them, except for the formula " in the Lord," which Christianizes them in the simplest possible way. Verse 21 is found almost verbatim in passages of Menander. But with v. 22, advice to slaves, we reach newly stamped Christian teaching.

(*b*) Titus ii. 1-10. Here we notice in v. 2 the Christian triad—faith, love, and endurance (a variant for hope)—and the two ἵνα-clauses of 5*b* and 10*b*; all else is common stock.

(*c*) Ephesians v. 22 *ff.*, according to the hypothesis, need not be derived from Colossians. The passage is a combination of *Haustafeln* with Christian teaching, imperfectly fused. Thus " himself the saviour of the body " has no parallel in the application to husband and wife.

(*d*) 1 Peter ii. 13-iii. 7 forms a complicated problem too long to discuss. Note these points: (i.) the introduction follows a common practice in pagan *Tafeln* of introducing duty towards the State (τὸ πρὸς πατρίδα καθῆκον). (ii.) Dependence on Rom. xiii. is improbable, for would 1 Peter have omitted the Christian colouring: " There is no power but of God," etc.? (iii.) The exhortation to slaves is given two motives, " What glory is it if, when ye sin, and are buffeted . . .," which might have been said by a Cynic, and the magnificent Good Friday appeal.

(*e*) Many passages in 1 Timothy. *E.g.*, ii. 9 has " shame " (αἰδώς) as a female virtue, specifically Greek, and here only in New Testament. In iii. the virtues of a bishop are essentially the conventional ones of biographies and inscriptions and even correspond largely with those expected in a general in Onosander's *de Imperatoris Officio*. This being so, " the husband of one wife " must, as in similar catalogues, be directed against polygamy. The widows, however, of ch. v. are clearly a Christian institution and the precepts are framed freshly for them.

Weidinger pursues the enquiry into the Apostolic Fathers, where we must not follow him. It will have been noticed that the method has little bearing on problems of authorship. If St. Paul utilized *Haustafeln* in Colossians he may have done so to a considerable extent in the Pastorals. Still more may St. Peter, whom no one claims as an original thinker, have done so in 1 Peter.

Rather than criticize the theory (which, subject to discussion of details, is surely sound) and its implications for Christianity in my own words, I add a summary of a page in H. Bremond's *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France* (iii. 134). He has been discussing the great Bérulle (died 1629, founder of the Oratory and leader of " the French School " of spirituality). He finds Bérulle's importance in this, that he was an innovator, basing Christian ascesis on the theology of St. Paul and St. John. From Cassian to Rodriguez the stream of Christian moralists had followed another method, less supernatural, less theological. They had resembled the pagan moralists such as the Stoics. Their works would be helpful in training an unbeliever. Bérulle, on the contrary, is *theocentric*. To put on Christ, rather than imitate Him, is his watchword. Christian morality is obtained by devotion to the Incarnate Word, who lives within the soul. Bremond's thesis is quite extraordinarily important. What is now a commonplace of Christian devotional practice arose, he maintains, as the fruit of the Counter-Reformation. But is he right in tracing the other method only so far back as Cassian ? Are not the Pastorals a clear example of the morality which a Stoic could have appreciated ? If we say Yes, we can proceed to ask whether any other method was possible for the Church than to take over the highest existing morality and gradually raise it through the indwelling of the Incarnate Word in generations of Christian lives.

Two final questions. Is the *extent* of the use of *Haustafeln* in the Pastoral Epistles a decisive argument against Pauline authorship ? Is moral progress possible along the lines of " putting on Christ " unless at the same time we firmly adhere to His imitation and practise all that is of permanent value in the Stoic discipline ?

XX

THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE EUCHARIST

IN the following pages some recent books on the Eucharist will be found summarized, with a little criticism. Probably the impression left on the reader who comes to the subject for the first time will be surprise at the gulf which yawns between current ecclesiastical controversy on the one hand and the facts, so far as they can be distinguished in the absence of clear light, of primitive Church life on the other. Will the higher criticism of liturgies eventually affect our Church life in the same way as the higher criticism of the Bible has affected it ?

As a specimen of the misunderstandings that still survive we may quote an utterance of a well-known Free Church divine. Sacramentalism, he says, is an insuperable barrier between Anglo-Catholics and Free Churchmen. " Between the faith and practice of the primitive Church and the *distinctive* faith and practice of ' Catholicism ' there is a complete abyss. . . . Historians are able to trace the process by which the change from Christianity to Catholicism took place. The pure stream of Christian practice became polluted with the muddy waters of Mithraism."[1]

The first book shall be G. P. Wetter's *Altchristliche Liturgien: Das Christliche Mysterium. Studie zur Geschichte des Abendmahles*.[2] The author was Professor of the New Testament at Upsala University. The late Professor Bousset had placed a MS. at his disposal in which the same conclusions were reached. The two scholars had often discussed the problems together. The author had also talked them over with M. Loisy, who agreed with his conclusions. When we add that English liturgical scholars have in the main provided the materials for the book, it will be seen that the whole is a noteworthy monu-

[1] The Rev. F. C. Spurr in *The British Weekly*, July 19, 1923.
[2] Göttingen, 1921.

ment of international scholarship. Professor Wetter belonged to the severest *religionsgeschichtlich* school. Anticipating for a moment his conclusions, we may say that they provide surprises both for Protestants and Catholics, except perhaps for the tiny minority of each who are liturgical experts. If Christianity passed through "the muddy waters of Mithraism," it was in the first few years of its existence. On the other hand, though Christianity is declared to have been sacramental from the outset and the Eucharist to have been the centre of Church life, yet the later conceptions of the Eucharist are said to differ radically from the primitive. If this conclusion can be substantiated, the Catholic will presumably remain unmoved, merely answering that the development was a true one.

Our author lays stress on his method, which is to interpret the early Church by the cultus (*i.e.* the Eucharist), and not by literary documents. The cultus is the conservative element in the Church. He examines the ancient liturgies, and especially those parts which are out of harmony with the general tendency. These are retained from motives of conservatism and show us an earlier stage of development. He checks his results by the stereotyped phrases of early writers, which, when not biblical quotations, are almost certainly of liturgical origin.

The first chapter deals with the "Epiphany" of the Lord. In the Liturgy of St. James after the Little Entrance comes an ἐκφώνησις [35]:[1] "For Thou art holy, O Lord our God, and dwellest and restest among the saints (ἐν ἁγίοις) and to Thee do we attribute the glory and the trishagion hymn, to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit now and always and for ever." The singers answer: "Holy God, holy mighty One, holy immortal One, have mercy upon us [35]." This phrase appears on Egyptian ostraka addressed to Christ, so that the Trinitarian formula is a later addition, a conclusion borne out by the Liturgy of the Syrian Jacobites [77], where the three "holies" each end with "who wast crucified for us." Original hymns addressed to Christ were therefore altered to

[1] The numbers in square brackets refer to the pages of Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western.*

become Trinitarian. So in the Cherubic hymn Christ comes attended by angels, and in the Anaphora the Sanctus and Benedictus are cries of the angels in which the faithful join. The same is true of the Egyptian rite [116 *ff.*].

These phrases do not suit their present context and go back to earlier ideas, in which the consecrated elements are subordinate to the Coming of the Lord to a meal with His own. *Cf.* the Great Entrance in the Byzantine Mass of the Presanctified [348]. "Now the powers of heaven worship with us invisibly. For behold the King of Glory enters. . . . With faith and fear let us approach that we may become partakers of eternal life." Similar examples are given from the Armenian and Nestorian Liturgies. "The Lord comes to His Church, His heavenly armies accompany Him, and this Parousia or Epiphany of His is greeted by the faithful with praise and song—these are the ideas which confront us clearly enough in them" (p. 11). The original force of "The Lord be with you," which comes in the Roman Mass as an introduction to the Mass of the Faithful, is seen in the very primitive Syriac version of The Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ—"then let the bishop say . . . with an awed voice, *Our* Lord be with you." The presence of Christ was manifested at this point, it is the Maranatha (*our* Lord come) of the Didache. The victory song of the angels is the nucleus from which the prayer reciting the saving acts of Christ has grown.

Very significant is the old custom represented later by the "prayer of the veil." The veil round the apse was removed, and Christians could by a charisma *see* the heavenly worship in which they were joining.[1] Later the veil surrounds the altar, or only the elements; "fear and trembling" at the removal of the veil from the chalice and paten refer to the offering of the sacrifice. But the original idea was the coming of the Dying and Rising Lord. This Epiphany in the cult was once hardly distinguishable from the eschatological Parousia,

[1] *Cf.* Chrysostom, 1 *Cor.* xxxvi. 6 (X. 340 E), καὶ σὺ τοίνυν καὶ πρὸ τοῦ καιροῦ τοῦ φρικώδους ἐκείνου διανάστηθι καὶ πρὶν ἰδεῖν τὰ παραπετάσματα ἀναστελλόμενα καὶ τὸν χόρον τῶν ἀγγέλων προβαίνοντα πρὸς αὐτόν, ἀνάβαινε τὸν οὐρανόν· ἀλλ' ἀγνοεῖ ταῦτα ὁ ἀμύητος. So Ignatius according to Socrates had a vision of angels at the Eucharist, and many monks are said by the *Historia Monachorum* to have enjoyed this privilege.

as we can see in the Didache. The phrase ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις ἀναπαυόμενος originally meant the Lord abiding with His comrades at the feast. In a sentence, the Eucharist was once Christocentric as in Pliny:[1] it became an offering of Christ to God, with prayers addressed to the Father.

In Chapter II. the main Eucharistic prayer is discussed, the Anaphora of the Eastern liturgies, introduced by a command to thank God and the answer "it is very meet," etc. (a phrase taken over from Jewish sources). There were two pure types. In (*a*) the beneficent acts of God are recounted; (*b*) is Christocentric, concerned with the saving acts of Christ. Neither of the two types has arisen from the other. They appear side by side in the Clementine Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions, where the second part of the Anaphora is Christocentric. Type (*a*) will be of Jewish origin with Christian interpolations; type (*b*) is specially Christian, a celebration of the Death and Resurrection of the Christian cult-God. It is impossible to discover one original form of the Liturgy, for the variations go back to the time when the prophets gave thanks as they wished. But the centre of the Liturgy is a hymn in which Christ's acts are remembered and He is praised. He is present, accompanied by angels. They praise Him because He is mighty, immortal, has left heaven, become man, suffered, died, and risen, for the sake of the initiates who are gathered round Him and glorify Him with the heavenly host. What happened then, happens now anew.[2] The Apostles' Creed has arisen from this complex of ideas, the Odes of Solomon presuppose it, as do the Epistles of Ignatius and St. Paul. "When Paul speaks of the Cross, of the Gospel of the Cross, he sees before him the drama which was enacted every Sunday in the cultus of the Church" (p. 47).

Chapter III. deals with the Words of Institution and the Anamnesis. In most Eastern liturgies the Anaphora ends

[1] Christo carmen quasi deo dicere secum invicem.

[2] *Cf.* Armenian Liturgy [436]. Jesus is present. "He it is that distributeth and Himself is distributed in the midst of us without ever being consumed"—*i.e.*, His death takes place in the Eucharist. In the *Liturgical Homilies of Narsai* we read: "Let us see Jesus who is being led to death on our account. On the paten and in the cup He goes forth with the deacon to suffer."

with the Words, followed by the Anamnesis and Epiclesis. In the Western Liturgy the Epiclesis is absent, and before the fifth century there are only vague traces of it in the Western Fathers. In *de Sacramentis* and St. Augustine the Words of Institution form the Consecration. In the East the Words of Institution are absent occasionally, as in the Nestorian Liturgy, some Armenian texts, and a Persian fragment. Elsewhere they seem to be interpolated into an older scheme. Thus in the Clementine Liturgy they follow the Ascension [20]. In the Armenian [436, 437] they come between the Cross and the Descent into Hell. The inference is that they were not originally connected with the hymn of victory in which Christ's saving acts were recited. The stages are these: (1) the hymn exists without the Words of Institution; (2) the Words are added as the authority for the rite;[1] (3) the centre of gravity shifts to the Words.

At this point Professor Wetter emphasizes the analogy between the nucleus of the Liturgy and the mystery cults. Both have the same technical terminology—*memores*,[2] *καταγγέλλειν*, *representare* ("show forth"). See especially Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiri*, and Lucian on the Attis-mysteries, where sufferings are commemorated. The tendency of the mysteries was for the imitating—commemorating—to take the form of spiritual service (*λογικὴ λατρεία*) rather than that of processions or dramatic representations. So the formulæ of the Eucharist are essentially an *act*, and *ποιεῖν* and *πράσσειν* are the verbs regularly employed.[3]

Professor Wetter's treatment of the Epiclesis may be introduced by a quotation from Duchesne's *Christian Worship* (p. 48). "After the Eucharist, certain inspired persons began to preach and to make manifest before the assembly the presence of the spirit which animated them. . . . There was, as it were, a Liturgy of the Holy Ghost after the Liturgy of Christ,

[1] *Cf.* W. C. Bishop in *Church Quarterly Review*, 1908, p. 392. "The Words of Institution were not recited as of themselves effecting the consecration, but rather as the authority in obedience to which the rite is performed."

[2] The Anamnesis of the Liturgy cannot be taken as = "remembering." In the light of parallels it must = "commemoration."

[3] *Cf. actio* of the Roman Canon.

a true Liturgy with a Real Presence and communion." Probably our author would accept this description if *after* could be altered to *at*. He points out that the Epiclesis is twofold, referring now to the worshippers, now to the elements. The former is the earlier idea. The two thoughts mingle in the Gregorian Liturgy: " Mitte super *nos* gratiam Spiritu tui sancti, qui sanctificet et transferat haec dona proposita in corpus et sanguinem salutis nostræ." The present Oriental Masses represent the Body and Blood as being on the altar immediately after the Epiclesis. Once the Lord was greeted as present without direct connection with the elements. The Spirit was " prayed down " upon the initiates.[1] Certain old liturgies (Armenian, etc.) speak of Christ sitting at the altar. " Ye who with faith stand before the holy royal table, see the King Christ sitting and surrounded with the heavenly hosts " [434]. The Emmaus-story exactly reproduces the atmosphere of the primitive Eucharist. The vagueness of the ideas is aptly illustrated by a Persian papyrus [515]: " Reliquit in manibus nostris pignus corporis sui sancti, ut de propinquo esset nobiscum per corpus suum et omni tempore se nobis immisceret per virtutem suam."

The results of the investigation so far are summed up as follows:

Jesus descends into the bread and wine and fills them with His glory and power. The Logos penetrates and transfigures their substance. As the Logos once took form on earth through the Virgin, so now He takes bodily form in bread and wine. The initiates are united with Christ, and thereby with one another. " To sit at table with Christ, to be united to Him, to be among the initiates, means, as in all mysteries, the deification of the initiates " (p. 84). The difference between the primitive and the later ideas is this: " Instead of active laity who are filled with the Spirit and speak with tongues, see God and praise Him for His salvation, the Bishop comes forward as the mediator between God and man. . . . In the old masses the chief thing is the *κοινωνία* with the Lord . . . now an irrational (*sinnlos*) miracle is the central point of the Mass—the magical change of the elements. . . . God does

[1] In the Liturgies of Serapion and St. Mark there is a Logos-Epiclesis.

not appear, He *is* here, made by the Epiclesis. The alteration is important. Perhaps nothing better illustrates the difference between primitive Christianity and the Catholic Church" (p. 88).

Results thus attained are checked and corroborated by the early writings of the Church, especially the Apocryphal Acts, Clement of Alexandria, I. Clement, and St. Ignatius. We cannot do more than allude to these interesting investigations. The Fourth Gospel agrees with what has been said. The final discourses come where the Last Supper comes in the Synoptists and are definitely Eucharistic. Jesus is the "mystagogue." The Epistles of Ignatius mark the transition between the life depicted in the Pauline writings and that of the liturgies. "The voice of the mysteries speaks unmistakably from his letters. The obscure, almost unintelligible phrases, the veiled speech, the ecstasy that frequently breaks out, the often glowing mysticism with which the initiate yearns to become united to this present God, to enter into His death, all these are facts which have already met us above in the Christian mysteries and even in the Hellenistic cults they are found in rich profusion. The Eucharist is a rite (*Weihe*), a mystery of Christ's death, not in the first place a participation in His Body and Blood" (p. 123). An interesting point is made in connection with Justin Martyr. He knows where the Christians get their conception of bread and wine as the Body and Blood of Christ, namely from the Memoirs of the Apostles. He could hardly have expressed himself so, if the Words of Institution had occurred in the liturgy known to him.

Returning to the New Testament,[1] Wetter discusses John vi. "Jesus is represented as the priest, who dies in a real historical sense before His people, and explains His death to them as the true mystery, into which they must be initiated in order to be saved" (p. 145). He *comes* down from heaven (present tense). He dies, rises, and *ascends* (*v.* 62)—in each Eucharist. It is as if we heard the priest's words explaining the mystery—"This is the bread. . . ."[2] Like St. John, St. Paul is

[1] The arrangement is not quite clear at this point.

[2] For a radically different interpretation *cf.* the Student Christian Movement *Commentary on St. John*, by R. H. Strachan, who thinks the Gospel was in part a protest against growing sacramentalism.

definitely Sacramental. All the thoughts of the Liturgies are present in him in germ. He apparently first saw the *announcing* of the death of Christ in the Eucharist, and laid stress on the wine which symbolized His blood. But in his time the service was "pneumatic." Anyone with the Spirit, seeing visions, speaking with tongues, etc., could be a leader. Later the prophets tried to maintain their position, but the weight of authority was against them. The Pastoral Epistles (probably), Clement and Ignatius all took the other side. The Egyptian Church Order records a stage when the bishop was expected to pray in his own words, but was tolerated if he learned a prayer by heart. The enthusiastic character of the original Eucharist and the ecstatic cries of the worshippers are preserved to-day in such fragments as "Hosanna," "Blessed is He that cometh . . ."

To sum up. The Eucharist is a *complexio oppositorum*. It has Jewish elements, but they are not of prime importance. The service was made by that which it had in common with the Hellenistic mysteries. Jesus had founded it and told His followers to remember Him in it. "The cultus is therefore the service ordered by God Himself. It is a remembrance of historical facts. This is true. . . . However, the Eucharist would never have been so formed as it now is, nor would the prayers have been so formulated as now, if this alone had been the motive at its origination" (p. 182). The celebration of the death and victory of the cult-God was united with a meal in which the poor were fed and at which the food was brought by the faithful to the president. Originally this was a preparation for the Eucharistic feast proper. At the end of the second century Jewish influences asserted themselves. The laity are pressed back. The priests bring in the elements in solemn procession. The elements are offered to God after being turned into Christ's Body and Blood. The Presence descends no longer on the worshippers but on the elements. The Cult is transformed. It now means "to bring to God an offering pleasing to Him, that He may be gracious to us, no more in the first instance to show forth the death of Christ." The Sacrifice of the Mass now confronts us; the author leaves this for a second book.

To keep the thread of the argument intact, we forbore to notice in its place a brilliant chapter on the martyrs. What has martyrdom to do with the Eucharist? In the Eucharist the death and resurrection of Christ were celebrated, and the initiate participated in both. But what happened symbolically in the mystery, happened with terrible earnestness in the case of the martyrs. The martyr died on the Cross with Christ. This explains the cult of the relics, which were to the Christians not merely the bodies of the sufferers but the Lord Himself, repeating His sufferings in them as in the mysteries of the Eucharist. Thus Pothinus at Lyons appeared "as if he were Christ Himself" (Eus. *H. E.* V. i. 30), and of Blandina it was said: "They looked on her in her conflict, and beheld with their outward eyes, in the form of their sister, Him who was crucified for them" (*ibid.* 41). The thought appears most clearly in Ignatius. He does not look for a reward, rather he expects to share Christ's glory, as His sufferings, "almost mechanically."[1] Mark x. 35 *ff.* is the earliest example of the new terminology. Drinking of the cup of Christ and being baptized with His baptism are phrases based on the Sacraments and martyrdom. We are far away from the Jewish idea of the suffering wise man in Wisdom, who bears tribulation for a period to win a lasting reward. Jesus willingly enters upon suffering in order to become the Saviour of the World, and His followers share His experience.[2]

A little criticism of this fine book must be attempted. For all the facts and quotations one is deeply grateful. The speculations and conclusions are fascinating but of less importance. The inherent weakness of the book lies precisely in this, that Professor Wetter is criticizing the Eucharist *ab extra*. No one

[1] Note the Eucharistic reference in Ign. *Rom.* iv. 1: "I am God's wheat," etc.; and vii. 3: "I desire the bread of God . . . and for drink I desire His blood." Martyrdom will be his final Eucharist. The context is entirely concerned with martyrdom.

[2] A common misconception of the *Quo Vadis* story deserves correction. St. Peter going out from Rome meets Christ, who reveals to him that crucifixion awaits him. "I go to be crucified again"—*i.e.*, when thou art crucified, I shall suffer in thy person. *Cf.* "Saul, why persecutest thou *Me*?" There is no hint of censure upon St. Peter's departure from Rome.

in whose life the Eucharist occupied the central place, whether priest or layman, could have ended so good a book with so feeble a conclusion, that about A.D. 200 the Sacrament ceased to be a showing of the Lord's death and became an offering of something to God. He would have known instinctively that it is and always has been both. The human mind cannot dwell on every side of a truth at once. Now one side is emphasized, now another. If something is for a while at the margin, instead of in the centre of, the field of attention, it cannot be contrasted with the central concept in the *entweder . . . oder* fashion.

What about the " waters of Mithraism " with which we started? According to this historian, a radical change took place about A.D. 200, *but from a Hellenistic cult-meal to a rite based largely on Old Testament sacrificial ideas*. The cult-meal is primitive. St. Paul was already immersed in the waters. Wetter is inclined to make the apostle an innovator, but 1 Cor. xi. 23 makes it quite clear that the Eucharistic tradition was received by St. Paul from the apostolic Church. (" I received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you." " Received " and " delivered " are two events of the same order. " Received " cannot therefore refer to a mystic communication direct from Christ.) The " Mithraic immersion " took place therefore in the first few years of the Church's life, long before any book of the New Testament was written. Wetter in this matter agrees with nearly all his scientific continental colleagues. As a matter of fact, he and they are inclined to draw comparisons between Christianity and the mysteries which are vitiated by neglect of one tremendous difference: the mysteries were concerned with mythical figures, the Christian cult with Jesus of Nazareth, with whom many of the first worshippers had lived. Nor is sufficient attention paid to the dates of documents, and the possibility that mystery-texts of the Christian era show signs of Christian influence.

Professor Wetter's account of Eucharistic development may prove to be right in its main outlines. The process is just what one would expect and corresponds closely with the evolution of Trinitarian dogma. In both cases the early

conceptions were vague, even naïve, and by the fourth century definiteness was attained. The Arian controversy taught the Church its own mind as regards the relation of the Son to the Father. But for many centuries there was no controversy about the Eucharist. That a radical change took place in the cult about A.D. 200 without apparently causing a ripple on the water is incredible. If we accept Wetter's facts, they seem capable of a simple explanation. The early Gentile Church was strongly anti-Judaic and, being composed of converts to whom Hellenistic cult-meals were familiar, it naturally laid stress on those aspects which were most congenial to them. After the second destruction of Jerusalem, all danger from Judaizing passed away, and the Church, which after all had received the Gospel from Jews, made far more use of Old Testament ideas as regards priesthood and sacrifice, *thus reverting to type*.

Some practical reflections may conclude a lengthy and in places technical review.

(i.) If the Words of Institution were not originally used, one phrase of the "Lambeth Quadrilateral" becomes doubtful, so far as the Eucharist is concerned—"the unfailing use of the Words of Institution."[1] Strictly speaking, the Words of Institution are not known, and those so called accompanied our Lord's *administration*, at least according to the Synoptic Gospels.

(ii.) The one constant feature of the primitive rite, the recital of the saving Acts of Christ, is absent from the English Rite of 1662.

(iii.) Professor Wetter's study gives rise to many thoughts of great devotional value, which might well find a place in our popular manuals.

(iv.) We cannot resuscitate the Liturgy of the primitive Church. For good or evil we must be Westerners. But the rich variety of interpretation which the Eucharist has received in the course of the centuries is a warning against rigorism in our teaching.

In his second volume[2] Wetter discusses the Sacrifice of the Mass. His method is the same as before, to begin with

[1] Not used in 1920.
[2] *Altchristliche Liturgien. II. Das christliche Opfer*, 1922.

fossils embedded in the present liturgies, phrases which would never have assumed their present form had they been composed for the position they now occupy, and which accordingly testify to an earlier stage of liturgical development. Having reached provisional conclusions with the help of the liturgies, he uses the non-liturgical evidence to corroborate them.

The opening chapter discusses the offering as it appears in the Eastern Liturgies. At an earlier stage it was an offering of gifts which were received by the deacons and presented on the altar by the priest. Intercessions were offered for those who brought the gifts and for those on whose behalf they were brought. In the present liturgies the original forms have been worked over, in the interests of the later theory of the Offering of Christ's Body and Blood, but enough remains to show the primitive intention. The general tendency has been to bring the accompanying prayers forward from the Mass of the Faithful to the Preparation.

As a specimen of Wetter's arguments let us take the Abyssinian Liturgy; the other liturgies receive similar treatment. In the introductory section we find the following prayer [Brightman, 199].

"Lord our God, Who didst accept the offering of Abel in the wild and of Noah in the ark and of Abraham on the mountain top and of Elijah . . . David . . . and the widow's mite in the sanctuary: accept likewise the oblation of Thy servant *John* which he has brought unto Thine holy name and let it be the redemption of his sins: recompense him with a goodly recompense in this world and in that which is to come both now and ever and world without end."

One New Testament offering is added to the Old Testament examples—the widow's mite. The oblation has already been made at the beginning of Mass. The offerer is mentioned by name, and recompense is expected both now and in the next world. The prayer is most inappropriate if taken to refer to the Sacrifice of the Mass, but eminently suited to the primitive idea of votive offerings. The parallel prayer in the Coptic Liturgy contains these words: "Remember, O Lord, those who have offered Thee these gifts and those for whom they

have brought them and those through whom they have brought them: grant them all the recompense from heaven." In the Abyssinian Liturgy as elsewhere an offering of gifts by the faithful for definite purposes has become a priestly action. Later (Brightman, 203) tithes and firstfruits are mentioned among the oblations. In the actual Mass of the Faithful the thought of offering is completely absent with the exception of a passing reference at the end of the chief prayer: "Remembering His death and His resurrection, we confess Thee *and offer unto Thee this bread and this cup*, giving thanks unto Thee." The words in italics seem to be an addition.

Before leaving the East we quote an interesting passage from the Nestorian Liturgy [272]: "Pray for me, my brethren and my beloved, that I be accounted worthy to offer before our Lord Christ this sacrifice living and holy for myself and for all the body of the holy Church." In its present context this is the Sacrifice of the Mass. But originally it cannot have been, for how could Christ's Body and Blood be offered to Christ?

The Western liturgies show the custom of offering gifts even more plainly than the Eastern. It lasted well on into the Middle Ages and was only suppressed by the consistent policy of Rome. The old prayers were partly suppressed, partly remodelled and put in other places.[1]

The custom of offering as it appears in non-liturgical sources, Western and Eastern, is now described. A striking example

[1] A few passages may be quoted. From the Roman Mass (early MSS.). "Memento, domine, famulorum famularumque tuarum N. et N. et omnium circumstantium quorum tibi fides cognita est et nota deuotio, qui tibi offerunt hoc sacrificium laudis pro se suisque omnibus, pro redemptione animarum suarum, pro spe salutis et incolumitatis suæ; tibi reddunt uota sua æterno deo et uiuo." As the offerers are mentioned by name and offer *uota*, the *sacrificium laudis* cannot originally have been the Sacrifice of the Mass. The Leonine Sacramentary. "Exsultantes domine cum muneribus ad altaria ueneranda concurrimus, quia et omnium nobis hodie summa uotorum et causa nostræ redemptionis exorta est" (Muratori, i., 763). "Ad altaria domine ueneranda *cum hostiis laudis* accedimus. Fac quæsumus ut et indulgentiam tuam nobis concilient et fauorem" (*ibid.*, 681). An old *Ordo* (Migne, *P.L.* cli. 886). "Sacerdos *oblationem accipiens* dicat: Suscipe sancta trinitas hanc oblationem, quam tibi offert famulus tuus, et præsta, ut in conspectum tuum tibi placens ascendat." The prayer has been remodelled, but the original rubric remains.

occurs in an *Ordo Romanus* of the ninth century, published by Duchesne.[1] After the reading of the Gospel the bishop rises from his seat to receive the offerings from the people, and the choir begin to sing the *offertorium*. The assistant ministers collect the bread and wine first from the men, then from the women. They wash their hands and proceed to separate from the gifts so much as is required for the Eucharist. Parallel accounts can be adduced from almost every province of the Western Church, though not in the official Roman masses. Jerome's witness is impressive for the fourth century. We see many " qui opprimunt per potentiam vel furta committunt, ut de multis parua pauperibus tribuant et in suis sceleribus glorientur, publiceque diaconus in ecclesiis recitet offerentium nomina, Tantum offert illa, Tantum ille pollicitus est, placentque sibi ad plausum populi."[2] This is borne out by a recent discovery[3] of a Church at Aquileia, dating from the early fourth century.

The Eucharist was celebrated in a separate room. A barrier separated the sanctuary from the place of assembly; it was pierced by two doors, through one of which, probably, the offerers came with their gifts, retiring by the other. In the main room mosaics decorate the floor. In the middle is a Victory with crown and palm between a basket with bread and a great cup. Round it are depicted men and women carrying bread for the most part, but also grapes, flowers, and a bird. Clearly we have a representation of the Eucharist procession, at an early stage, when the laity brought their own gifts; later they gave them to the deacons, who brought them to the altar. Remains of the simple wooden table in the middle of the inner room, upon which the gifts were laid, are still visible.

Great importance was attached in early times to the offering taking place after catechumens, etc., had withdrawn. Whoever was allowed to offer was naturally allowed to communicate. The custom is presupposed by the well-known anecdote in the Life of Gregory the Great (*Vita*, ii. 41); a woman doubted

[1] *Christian Worship*, p. 459.
[2] *Comm. in Ezek.* 18 (Migne, *P.L.* xxv. 175), *cf. Ep.* 8.
[3] First described in 1915. See Lietzmann in *Z.N.T.W.* (1921), p. 249*f.*

whether the oblation, which she had herself made, could be the Body of Christ.

M. Loisy contributes a fascinating account of a survival in France of the old custom. In his native village of Ambrières (Marne), as in all the surrounding district, up to about 1850, bread and wine were offered at funeral masses. This was confined to women, the men bringing money. The money went to the priest, the food to him, the choristers and the poor. His mother tells how her grandfather's shepherd used to bring a lamb to the altar for an offering at Christmas. The well-known custom of *pain bénit* is another survival. In country parishes the offering is made by the different households in turn. The choir boys solemnly bring it up, followed by the offerer (generally a girl), who bears a candle. The bread is cut up in the sacristy and distributed to the congregation, who eat it as a kind of sub-sacramental communion.[1]

Returning to the primitive Church, we find many illustrative passages in the African Fathers. A very clear example occurs in Cyprian's *De Opere et Eleem.*, 15. He blames a rich woman who thinks she can celebrate the Lord's Supper when she comes empty handed and partakes of the sacrifice offered by a poor person.

In the East the custom was suppressed at an early date, so fewer traces than in the West are to be expected. But some remain. See the Syriac *Didascalia* (ii. 36): "Offer ei (God) *sacrificia* ipsius assidue omni tempore, neque amovearis ab ecclesia, et cum acceperis *eucharistiam sacrificii*, omnia quæ in manus tuas ueniunt, mitte et communica cum peregrinis, haec enim episcopo collecta sunt ad peregrinos omnes sustentandos. Propterea quantum potes sepone ac prouide, quoniam dominus in lege dixit: non apparebis coram me vacuus." The conclusion is that gifts of every kind were offered. The Apostolic Canons mark a stage in the development by prescribing that only bread and wine shall be offered at the altar; other gifts are to be brought to the house of the bishop or presbyter.

The evidence of the first two centuries is unavoidably scanty.

[1] This is the origin of the stories of Anglican and Protestant visitors being invited to communicate in France. Note how the primitive oblation and the Agape are associated with the Mass.

The materials are full of gaps and we must not expect to hear much about a feature of the *Missa Fidelium*. Irenæus is the most important witness. "Giving directions to the disciples to offer to God the firstfruits of His own created things—not as if He stood in need of them, but that they might be themselves neither unfruitful nor ungrateful—He took that created thing, bread, and gave thanks, and said 'This is My body.' And the cup likewise, which is part of that creation to which we belong, He confessed to be His blood, and taught the new oblation of the new covenant; which the Church receiving from the apostles offers to God throughout all the world, to Him who gives us as the means of subsistence the firstfruits of His own gifts in the New Testament. . . ." (IV. xvii. 5). "The oblation of the Church . . . is accounted with God a pure sacrifice, and is acceptable to Him, not that He stands in need of a sacrifice from us, but that he who offers is himself glorified in what he does offer, if his gift be accepted (Mt. v. 23, 24 is quoted—bringing a gift to the altar). We are bound therefore to offer to God the firstfruits of His creation" (IV. xviii. 1). This passage clearly refers to the custom described above. "He who offers" is the layman, not the priest. However, to Irenæus the bread and wine are clearly the Body and Blood of Christ (IV. xviii. 4 *f.*). The character of the Eucharistic elements is ascribed to the gifts from which they are chosen. This is a transitional stage on the road to the complete doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. If Irenæus is the chief witness, Justin Martyr, the Didache, and Clement corroborate the impression already gained.

In a final chapter, Professor Wetter draws together the threads of his discussion. There are no real heathen parallels to the complex of thoughts underlying the primitive Eucharist. It is definitely Christian and has two roots. The first is the presence of the Lord whose death and resurrection are mystically represented,[1] the second is the offering of gifts to God. The moment the two are brought into relation, the Catholic Mass is there, and the bread and wine (chosen from the totality of gifts) are felt to be the Body and Blood of Christ. The offering was a moralization of the votive offerings and sacrifices

[1] This is fully discussed in Wetter's first volume.

of the ancient world. At a time when the lower classes felt the severest economic pressure, the substitution of the Christian feast, at which the offerings were not destroyed but put to good uses, for sacrifices was warmly welcomed.

The custom became very popular and threatened to drive out the " mystery," but the fusion of the two things saved the situation.[1] But the offering soon lost its pride of place; transferred to the preparatory part of the service it lasted a long while. By way of compensation for the loss the bringing of the elements, and the selection of a part for use, *by the priest* assumed great solemnity. In the East it became a separate act preparatory to the service. Many a feature in existing liturgies is rightly understood as a primitive act of the laity now performed by the priest. The close of the second and the beginning of the third centuries seem to be the turning point in this development. The primitive Eucharistic meal was separated from the service and secularized. Deprived of its holy associations it developed abuses and was deservedly suppressed.[2]

In noticing K. Völker's important book *Mysterium und Agape* (Gotha, 1927) for the sake of brevity we must confine ourselves to his theory of the Agape, neglecting much else of value. The outstanding feature of the theory is the rejection of all early testimony to a social meal held in connection with the Eucharist. The chief passages relied on in the ordinary view are as follows:

(*a*) Acts ii. 42, 46; vi. 2. In ii. 42, " they continued stedfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers," the third item is clearly religious; it denotes a solemn, symbolical partaking of food, not a satisfying meal, which indeed on practical grounds is most unlikely in view of the large number of adherents. Quite possibly

[1] The Epiclesis was originally a blessing of the gifts, not a transforming of the elements. This is argued at length.

[2] *Cf. Conc. Laod.*, 28 (middle of fourth century). ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν τοῖς κυριακοις ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τὰς λεγομένας ἀγάπας ποιεῖν καὶ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀκούβιτα στρωννύειν. Does not this reference to the " so-called agapes " suggest that the name in the technical sense and therefore the thing were novelties ? See below.

there are three constituent parts, not four, "the breaking of bread" being explanatory of "fellowship." In ii. 46 the prayers in the temple are contrasted with "breaking bread at home." In the light of subsequent practice, Acts xx. 7, the *Didache*, Justin, etc., this is most naturally taken of a Sunday meeting in *one* place, expressing the unity of the Church, for the purpose of a symbolic Eucharistic meal, which would not exclude weekday meetings for the same purpose in private houses. In vi. 2 we read of certain officers appointed to "serve tables," with special reference to the needs of Hellenistic widows. No doubt this refers to one section of the charitable relief pre-eminently developed in the Church of Jerusalem; but there is no hint that it was connected with the official "breaking of the bread."

(*b*) 1 Cor. xi. 17 *ff.* is explained thus. A common meal for satisfying hunger presented great difficulties. The ordinary food of the poorest would not satisfy the well-to-do; to provide for all the food of the latter would be financially impossible. But an abuse has grown up which makes a "dominical supper" impossible. Individuals bring their own food with which to satisfy hunger. The rich come early and in effect "picnic"; the poor come when their work is done. The symbolical bread and wine are shared, but no more. The abuse is sternly rebuked. "When ye come together to eat (*i.e.* to celebrate the Lord's Supper), wait one for another"; satisfy hunger at home. Here again we look in vain for a common satisfying meal.

(*c*) Ignatius, *Trall.* ii. 3: "the deacons are not deacons of foods and drinks, but ministers of the Church of God." Ignatius protests against the view that food and drink were a main preoccupation of the deacons. As part of their work for the poor they were concerned with food questions, but if the Agape were really part of the cult Ignatius would not have written thus.

(*d*) Justin (1 *Apol.* xiii. 1, xiv. 3, lxvii. 1) merely refers to the charitable activities of the Church.

(*e*) Pliny to Trajan: "rursusque coeundi ad capiendum cibum promiscuum tamen et innoxium." We must not expect accurate descriptions from Pliny, who merely wishes to clear

the Christians from the charge of Thyestean banquets. To what reality does this picture correspond, of believers assembling before sunrise on Sunday morning to sing hymns to Christ as God and bind themselves by a *sacramentum* not to commit serious crimes, dispersing to meet again at night for a common meal? The first part of the account is an impossible description of the Eucharist. Apparently it is a distorted version of Baptism, in which case the evening gathering is the Eucharist.

(*f*) *Didache* x. 1: "after ye are filled" is said to imply that the feeding of ix. is a satisfying meal, the Jewish prayers of thanksgiving over food supporting the view. But all is spiritualized. The contrast is clear between the Jewish food of the body and the Christian food of the soul (see x. 3).

This is enough for our purpose, since the other passages discussed are later. While we shall probably recognize the cogency of Völker's arguments in the main, he seems to be trying to prove too much. In the nature of things arrangements for meals in the unorganized primitive period must have varied considerably, and it is *a priori* probable that there were some early precedents for the later (if we accept Völker's view) Agape, and that they were in places associated with the Eucharist.

The Agape is described by Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria and in the Church Orders, so by the end of the second century it was firmly established. It was a regular, satisfying meal, not primarily designed to succour poverty. Tertullian's silence as to the association of Agape and Eucharist is significant; for him they are clearly distinct. The Church Orders mention four kinds of meals—the Agape proper, meals for the poor on Sunday, a meal for widows, and the commemoration of the dead. The last (*ἀνάμνησις pro iis, qui defuncti sunt*) is expressly connected with the Eucharist (*primum antequam consideant, mysterium sumant*) and is distinct from the Agape proper. Völker summarizes the evidence for Agapes thus: (1) They were arranged by well-to-do persons in private houses to benefit others; (2) their purpose was social intercourse, charitable help, and edification, the second object gaining at the expense of the other two; (3) there was no obliga-

tion to undertake the provision of Agapes; (4) the meal was brought into connection with Church life in that catechumens were excluded and the blessing of the bread (saying grace) was spoken by a cleric only.

The origin of the Agape must be separated from the Eucharist. Luke xiv. 13 *f.*: "When thou makest a feast . . ." may be assumed to be the text from which it began, as indeed Clement and the Apostolic Constitutions assert. Jewish rather than pagan antecedents are to be sought. St. Paul's clear line of distinction between meals in honour of demons and the Christian Feast (1 Cor. x. 21) must have been applicable to the Agape. Völker finds the actual origin of the Agape as a regular Church institution in the Gnostic practice of sacred meals. The line dividing the great Church and Gnosticism in the period 160-200 was fluctuating, and a Gnostic practice so attractive to the masses will have easily entered. The Church authorities directed the movement into harmless channels of charitable activity. In the fourth century conditions changed and the Agape began to die out. One potent cause for its desuetude was the building of fine churches, clearly unsuitable for meals, in the place of the earlier halls.

Dr. Oesterley, in his *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (1925), begins with a description of the Jewish liturgical sources. The Mishnah as a whole reflects early practice, and the liturgical data especially so, since in matters of worship mankind is notoriously conservative. We must assume that, when the break came between the Jews and the Christians, much of the Sabbath synagogue service was transferred to the Christian Church. Before the break Jerusalem had exercised a general supervision, and presumably its authority had been followed as regards worship; the causes of difference between Palestinian and Hellenistic Christians had nothing to do with liturgical matters. The elements of Jewish worship were as follows: (1) Scripture Reading; (2) Exposition; (3) the *Shema* ("Hear, O Israel . . ."), practically a Creed; (4) the Benedictions and other fixed prayers; (5) other prayers, not written down, variable but stereotyped; (6) the Amen; (7) the

Kaddish, which grew out of the ascription at the end of the discourse;[1] (8) the Psalms; (9) Confession; (10) the *Kiddush*, ushering in the Sabbath; and (11) the Decalogue.

All these elements are represented in early Christian worship, as Dr. Oesterley proves. Specially impressive is his demonstration that the liturgical thanksgiving in 1 Clement is built up from the Eighteen Benedictions and other Jewish Prayers.

The account of the origin of the Eucharist is as follows. It is not exactly new, but is restated in a manner which removes difficulties previously felt. The Institution took place at the end of a meal, which was not the Passover, since four cups were used for that feast. What was this meal?

Pious Jews met on Friday afternoons at the house of a friend for a religious and social meal. They formed a *Chābūrah*, or society (*Chābāra*="comrade"). At dusk the meal was interrupted, for the Sabbath then began. The president took a cup of wine and pronounced a benediction, the *Kĕdūshath ha-yōm*, "sanctification of the (Sabbath) day." In early post-Christian times the meal and ceremony were transferred to the synagogue and known as *Kiddūsh*. This meal and ceremony took place also on the eve of great festivals. Christ and the Apostles formed a *Chābūrah*. Their Passover-Eve meeting would consist of (1) a Grace; (2) a social meal; (3) conversation on religious subjects (a developed form is preserved in John xiv.-xvi.); (4) "the Sanctification," which would take the form of a combined commemoration of the Sabbath and redemption from Egyptian bondage. The meal was transferred to Thursday because the Day of Preparation, when the lambs were sacrificed, was regarded as an introduction to the feast. The Passover flavour of this ceremony would leave the impression that it was a Passover meal.

The great attractiveness of this theory lies in the fact that it explains (*a*) the apparent contradiction between the first three Gospels and the Fourth; (*b*) the *weekly* repetition of the

[1] Perhaps one may be allowed a protest against the growing disuse of the ascription at the end of the sermon in Anglican churches. A formula which was used by the Fathers, and presumably by the Apostles in all essentials, is too precious to be set aside in favour of a repetition of the opening Invocation.

Eucharist—the Feast which it commemorated being the weekly *Kiddūsh*; (*c*) the Agape, which was a continuation of the social meal which preceded the original Eucharist.

Dr. Oesterley has an interesting section on the Epiclesis, in which he argues that the fifth century form was an invocation upon both the worshippers and the elements, but that in the fourth century, except in Cyril of Jerusalem, there is no *definite* conception of the conversion of the elements by the descent of the Holy Spirit. In the second and third centuries the evidence suggests that the Epiclesis was concerned with the worshippers only. Its origin was a prayer for the Divine Presence among the worshippers in the sense of Matt. xviii. 20 ("where two or three . . ."), rooted in the Jewish idea of the Shechinah. The argument is suggestive, but I distrust the attempt to get rid of the Epiclesis upon the elements in the fourth century. Dr. Oesterley lays stress on the word used in the Apostolic Constitutions—*ἀποφήνῃ* and not *ποιῇ* [Brightman, 21], which he translates "show forth" or "declare." But "make" is a well-attested sense of *ἀποφαίνω*; the new Liddell and Scott adds Lucian to Aristophanes and Xenophon as authors who use it in this sense. Again, Dr. Oesterley points out that the fourth century Liturgy of Sarapion has a different Epiclesis from the developed fifth century form—"May Thy holy Word abide upon this bread, that the bread may become the body of Thy Word. . . ." He omits to mention the earlier Epiclesis in the same prayer—"Fill this sacrifice with Thy power." We do not expect very precise language at a period before the theological definitions of the Holy Spirit. But the *meaning* of the common Eastern Epiclesis upon the elements is clearly seen in Sarapion.

The striking merit of Lietzmann's book (*Messe und Herrenmahl*, 1926) consists in the systematic method in which he classifies the various versions of the Canon, forming them into different families and detecting the contamination of one type by another. No such massive work has been done before. In a different province it is the method of Westcott and Hort applied to hitherto intractable material. The result is curiously similar. As there are two main types of New Testament Text,

the Egyptian (ℵ B and Origen) and the " Western," so there are two main families of Liturgies, the Egyptian and another. Lietzmann connects this with the fact that Egypt was the only important Church not affected by St. Paul. The parallel is very close. Just as the history of the New Testament Text is fairly clear from the beginning of the third century onwards, but before then we are in the dark, so Lietzmann's facts are splendidly illuminating for the period in which the evidence is plentiful, but his arguments for the early period are very speculative.[1]

The main liturgical families are (1) the developed Byzantine Liturgy, (2) the Antiochian Liturgy of the fourth century, preserved in the Apostolic Constitutions, (3) the Liturgy of St. James (Jerusalem), (4) the Nestorian Liturgy, (5) the Egyptian Liturgy—St. Mark, Sarapion, and the Papyrus of Dêr-Balyzeh, and (6) the early Roman Liturgy, of which the Egyptian Church Order (Hippolytus) is the most important witness, but which can be reconstructed in a measure from the Gallican and other Western Masses. The restoration of the original types of the different families is carried out with great skill. " Contamination " must be eliminated, and conformity to the received biblical text is generally a sign of later origin. The Canon only is discussed, and the great Intercession is omitted. Each section is considered separately. The conclusion of the discussion, as we have said, is that the Egyptian Liturgy formed one type, the others a rival type, and that, the inquiry being pushed back to origins, this divergence must be connected with the fact that Egypt was the one important Church not directly influenced by St. Paul.

As regards the Epiclesis, the important thing to note is that its occurrence at the beginning of the Canon is an Egyptian peculiarity. In Sarapion there is a double Epiclesis. The first, beginning *πλήρης ἐστὶν ὁ οὐρανός . . . πλήρωσον καὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην τῆς σῆς δυνάμεως . . .*, and catching up the last words of the Sanctus, is possible only where the Benedictus is omitted, *i.e. in Egypt*; therefore the second Epiclesis has come in from the Syrian-Byzantine rite. Lietz-

[1] The thought of the paragraph is taken from a review by von der Goltz.

mann's explanations of the faded Epiclesis of the present Roman Canon are most interesting.

In opposition to Wetter, who thinks that an original offering of gifts was transformed about 200 into a sacrifice in the later sense, Lietzmann finds throughout the first three centuries a Eucharistic sacrifice in a triple sense: the offering of prayers, the offering of bread and wine, and the act of the altar analogous to the death of Christ. A fourth kind of offering began in the fourth century, that of incense, first attested in Ephrem Syrus in 363; St. Ambrose is the oldest witness for the West. The prayer for the reception of the sacrifice at the heavenly altar is connected with the introduction of incense.

The climax of the book is the proof that the non-Egyptian rite, best represented by the Hippolytan Canon, regards the Epiclesis as the act of consecration, is closely connected with Pauline Christology, and goes back to the apostle's practice; while the Egyptian type originally knew no words of administration and was not connected with the death of Christ—it was derived from the primitive practice of the Jerusalem Church.

The brilliance and fascination of the book are beyond praise. The author has qualified himself for writing it by editing many of the texts, and his work opens a new era in liturgical study. If we demur to his conclusions it is not because we can answer his arguments, but from a conviction that there must be an error in a chain of reasoning which leads us to a radical divergence between St. Paul and the Twelve. So many fashionable theories which involved the separation of Hellenistic Christianity from the Mother-Church have flourished for a while and then been abandoned that it is hard to believe that Lietzmann's solution of this problem will prove correct.

XXI

CONFESSION TO LAYMEN

IN this essay I shall attempt to tread an interesting bypath of Church history, very little known except to specialists, and to describe confession to laymen, not in the exceptional sense (as for example on the battlefield) in which it is familiar in the West, but as a regular institution of the Eastern Church in the early Middle Ages. I begin by sketching very briefly the history of confession up to 1215 as given in O. D. Watkins' monumental work, *A History of Penance*.[1] Some of the statements will have to be reconsidered later when the outlines of the sketch come to be filled in.

I

The Church of to-day agrees with that of primitive antiquity in attaching great importance to the power of binding and loosing. But whereas modern practice is almost entirely a matter of loosing, the ancient Church laid stress on binding. The purity of the Bride of Christ was the first consideration. There were three capital sins, or sins unto death: idolatry, tantamount to apostasy, impurity, and murder. In the second century it was commonly held, so we learn from Hermas, that for such grave offences there was no forgiveness except in baptism. The Church had no mandate to pardon them, they were left to the mercy of God. Hermas assumes that the severer view was justified, but concessions were made and henceforward "penitents" and public confession existed at Rome. It was agreed that penance for post-baptismal sin was possible once only in a life-time. Sins now called venial hardly came under the scope of penance. The bishop was the normal minister of reconciliation.

[1] A very useful and cheap treatment of the early period up to 400 is provided by Haslehurst's *Penitential Discipline in the Early Church* (S.P.C.K., 1921).

The evidence of Origen is important but controverted. Confession is ordered to be made to a spiritual man, a priest of the Church, a learned physician. Some of the instructions presuppose a system of confession independent of public penance. The physician of the soul is not expressly termed a priest, " but the sort of experience which he is required to have could seldom fall to a layman."[1] The unworthiness of the minister affects this rite. " But if he is bound by the chains of his sins it is in vain that he either binds or looses."[2] The Church has not followed Origen in this.[3]

The Decian persecution forms a landmark. The Church now asserted the prerogative of absolution for those who had failed. Confession at this time was to the bishop only, though the deacon could act as his representative. Naturally it was a rare occurrence if the bishop was its normal minister. From 252 onwards, the date of the Novatianist schism, the Church exercised powers with respect to sins which had formerly been left to the mercy of God.

The period 350-430 was one in which discipline was ineffective " except for (*a*) those who voluntarily sought it and (*b*) a few exceptional and notorious cases indicated for punishment by authority."[4] The difference between Antioch and Asia Minor is startling. Basil's canonical epistles show a system of graded and severe penances enforced only with difficulty. There seems to have been no formal expression of reconciliation other than restoration to communion. Chrysostom attacks the rigorous Asian system and proclaims repeated penitence and repeated forgiveness; but the penitent has liberty, and confession is not necessary to forgiveness.

The Church of Constantinople inherited no traditions. The Asiatic system probably never got a footing. About 391 the penitentiary was abolished by Nectarius. The significance of this is disputed. This official seems to have taken the place of public penance, not of private confession. He was abolished because he was only a survival and the practice had fallen into desuetude. In any case the time was marked by a relaxation

[1] Watkins, p. 139. [2] *Comm. in Matt.* xvi. 18.
[3] But the Eastern Church for centuries *did* follow him.
[4] Watkins, p. 319.

of morals. " In the fifth century Penance in time of health was nearly lost in the West, as in the East, and it would have to be regained."[1] The recovery was to come in an unexpected way. We note in passing that " no verbal absolution in any form but that of prayer is known to have been preserved."[2] The supplicatory form is still preserved in the East. While no *Ego te absoluo* is known before the thirteenth century, it is possible that such forms had their roots in antiquity.

The modern Western system of penance originated in Celtic monasticism. We must distinguish between confession as a devotional habit and confession which preceded or formed part of reconciliation and restoration to communion. There is "no indication that any ceremony, or any form of absolving words, was used by any priest at the point of time when, the penance having been accomplished, the penitent proceeded to make his communion."[3] As the monks confessed to their head, so sisters confessed to the abbess, quite apart from any Church discipline. The Continental system of public penance never gained a foothold in these islands. The early Church of the English accepted the Celtic system, which spread from Britain and Ireland to the Continent and eventually reached Italy. By a kind of " osmosis "[4] laymen outside monasteries were led to adopt the monks' practice. Finally it was stereotyped into the modern system by the Lateran Council of 1215.

II

It is a defect in Dr. Watkins' fine book that he leaves the Eastern Church in the fifth century, and neglects the fascinating story of confession as taught and practised there in the following centuries. We can best introduce the special subject of these articles by giving extracts from a document of the eleventh century, the Epistle " Concerning Confession " by Simeon the New Theologian formerly ascribed to St. John Damascene. It is printed in Dr. Holl's *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim*

[1] Watkins, p. 465.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 493.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 612.
[4] The phrase is Dr. Hörmann's.

griechischen Mönchtum[1] (Leipzig, 1898); also in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* cxx.

Simeon was born about 965 in Paphlagonia, and went to Constantinople as a boy. He entered the monastery of Studium, where Simeon the Studite became his spiritual father. At the age of twenty-two he was called to be a monk. He was ordained and eventually became Hegoumenos. By this time the Studite was dead. Nicetas the Syncellos, jealous of Simeon, attacked him for making Simeon the Studite a saint. He pleaded before the Patriarch; questions of fact only were argued, for no one doubted the possibility of honouring one lately deceased as a saint. At first Simeon won, but Nicetas persevered and after six years Simeon was ordered to destroy the ikons of his spiritual father. He refused and was banished from the capital. Influential attempts were made to bring him back, but he preferred to stay where he was, and founded a new monastery.

The significance of all this is that Simeon was under suspicion for heresy during a large part of his life, but no voice was raised against him for his teaching on confession, which must therefore represent the mind of the contemporary Church of Constantinople. This was, in brief, that a fallen sinner is helpless to get up again, without the help of a mediator. This mediator must be a "friend of God," one who possesses the high dignity of binding and loosing. Bishops, who first had the dignity, have forfeited it; so have priests. It has come to the monks, many of whom also are unworthy. The right of binding and loosing is therefore a personal prerogative of those who are true disciples of Christ and possess the Spirit, as shown by their charismatic gifts.

Simeon keeps the theoretical possibility of priests' exercising the power, but assumes that they do not. As against his opponents he maintains that only the spiritual among the monks, whether cleric or lay, possess the power. They would have answered that it was confined to priest-monks.

[1] The materials for this article have been drawn from Holl, and to a less extent from Hörmann, *Untersuchungen zur griechischen Laienbeicht* (Donauwörth, 1913).

THE TREATISE OF SIMEON THE NEW THEOLOGIAN ON CONFESSION

1. Thou hast commanded our poverty, father and brother, putting a question, to tell thee: "Whether it is permissible for men to confess their sins to monks who have not the priesthood," adding this: "for we hear that to the priests alone has been given the authority to bind and loose." Now these are the words and the helpful questions of thy devout soul and of thy fervent desire and prayer. And we have ascertained thy good purpose, how that thou seekest to learn about divine and holy things, but we are unable to discern or write about such things and therefore should have preferred to keep silence. For to compare spiritual things with spiritual is the part of impassive and holy men, from whom we are far removed in life and utterance and virtues.

2. [S. calls upon God for help in his task.]

3. [We are all God's debtors, but baptism bestows wealth.]

4. [We and the treasure within us are kept by the Commandments, which like so many guards keep us and not we them.]

5. [He that has fallen among robbers, spiritually speaking, and has been wounded, needs a physician and a mediator.] He that has done such things and so angered his master and God cannot otherwise be reconciled to God than through a mediator, a holy man, a friend and servant of Christ, and through the shunning of evil.

6. [The moment we are wounded, let us fly to the spiritual physician, and take his remedies and antidotes for poison.]

7. Seek, if thou please, a mediator and physician and good counsellor, that as a good counsellor he may suggest ways of repentance in a manner appropriate to good counsel, as a physician may give thee a drug suitable to each wound, and as a mediator by prayer and intercession with God, standing before Him face to face, may propitiate the Divine Being on thy behalf. Do not therefore strive to find a flatterer or belly slave and make him thy counsellor and ally, lest concurring in thy will he teach thee not what God loves but what thou dost welcome, and thou remain still verily an unreconciled enemy. Nor shouldest thou seek an inexperienced physician, lest by his great severity and untimely cuttings and burnings he land thee in a pit of despair, or again by his excessive sympathy he leave

thee diseased and—most terrible fate—hand thee over, still thinking thyself well, to eternal punishment in a way thou expectest not. For this fate the earthly disease of the soul dying with us procures for us. But a mediator between God and men is not I think secured so simply. " For they are not all Israelites which are of Israel," but they who understand clearly according to the name and actual power of the name and, being intelligent, see God. Nor are all those who are called by the name of Christ really Christians. " For not everyone that saith to me, Lord, Lord " saith Christ " shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father." So also elsewhere: " Many shall say to me in that day, Lord, have we not cast out devils in thy name ? and I shall say to them, Verily I say to you, I know you not, depart from me, ye workers of iniquity."

8. [The care necessary in both mediators and sinners.]

9, 10. [Further exhortations.] But let us now say what thou, child, hast sought to learn.

11. For that it is permissible for us to confess to a monk who does not possess the priesthood, this thou wilt find has taken place since the time that the garment and cloak of repentance was given by God to His inheritance and men called monks appeared. This is written in the inspired writings of the fathers, in which if thou lookest thou wilt find how true my words are. But before them high priests [*i.e.*, bishops] alone used to receive authority to bind and loose in succession from the divine apostles, but as time went on and the high priest became useless, the awesome commission passed to priests of blameless life and counted worthy of divine grace. Then these also fell away, priests and high priests together becoming like the rest of the people and many, as we see to-day, encountering deceitful spirits and foolish vanities and being lost, and the commission, as we have said, was transferred to the elect people of God, I mean the monks. Not that the priests or high priests were deprived of it; rather they parted with it themselves. " For every priest is constituted as a mediator with God between God and men " as Paul says " and ought to offer sacrifice as for the people so also for himself."

12. But let us begin our discourse higher up and see whence and how and to whom this authority of sacrificing and binding and losing was given originally, and the answer shall be set out in order and clearly to match thy question, not only for thy benefit but also for all others.

When our Lord and God and Saviour said to the man with the withered hand: "Thy sins are forgiven thee," the Hebrews hearing said: "This man speaketh blasphemy. Who can forgive sins except God alone?" Never yet had forgiveness of sins been given thus, not by prophets or priests or by any one of the patriarchs. Wherefore the scribes were annoyed as though some new dogma or surprising thing were being proclaimed. But the Lord did not blame them for this but rather He taught them what they did not know, showing that He was God and was not as man bestowing the forgiveness of sins committed. For He says to them: "That ye may know that the Son of Man hath authority to forgive sins, He says to the man with the withered hand, Stretch out thy hand, and he stretched it out and it was restored whole as the other"; thus confirming the greater and invisible wonder by that which was visible. Similarly with Zacchæus, the harlot, Matthew from the receipt of custom, Peter after his three-fold denial, and the paralytic whom He healed and finding subsequently said to him: "Behold thou art become whole, sin no more lest a worse thing befall thee." Saying this He showed that the man fell into the disease through sin, and when he was freed from it he received also the forgiveness of his sins. For Christ demanded no long times (of waiting), no fasting, no lying on the ground, but only conversion and unhesitating faith and cutting away of evil and true repentance and many tears—witness the harlot and Peter weeping bitterly.

Here is the beginning of this great gift befitting God only, which He alone possessed. Then, about to return to heaven, He leaves such a gift to His disciples in His stead. But how did He bestow upon them this honour and authority? Let us learn who they were and how many and when it happened. They were the eleven chosen disciples, the doors were shut, and they were gathered together within. For coming and standing in their midst He breathed on them and said: "Receive the Holy Spirit; whose soever sins ye forgive they are forgiven unto them; whose soever ye retain, they are retained." He gives them no command at the time concerning penalties, since they were about to be taught by the Holy Spirit.

13. So, as we have said, the holy apostles transmitted this authority by way of succession to those who occupied their thrones, since of the rest no one dared even to think of such a thing. So carefully did the disciples of the Lord guard the just assignment of this authority. But in process of time,

as we said above, the worthy were confused and mingled with the unworthy and were hidden by the crowd, each being ambitious to surpass the other and falsely claiming the pre-eminence in virtue. For after those who occupied the thrones of the apostles were proved to be fleshly and pleasure-loving and vain-glorious and they turned aside to heresies, the divine grace deserted them and this authority was taken from such men. Wherefore, dispensing with all other things which sacrificing priests ought to have, they require the possession of this alone—orthodoxy. And I am not sure even of this, for not he who refrains from introducing new dogmas into the Church of God is orthodox, but he who has a life in harmony with right doctrine. But such a life the patriarchs and metropolitans of to-day either have sought and failed to find, or else having found it they have preferred the unworthy life, asking only this, the setting forth in writing of the symbol of the faith, and accepting only this, that a man be not a zealot for good or contend with any on account of evil. Thus they win peace as it were on earth for the church, but it is worse than any enmity and the cause of great instability. On this account the priests have become useless and like the people. For none of them was salt, to quote the Lord's word, that they might bind up with rebukes and restore by all possible means the diseased life, but rather they condoned and covered up one another's vices and became worse than the people, and the people in their turn worse than they. But some of the people proved themselves better than the priests, shining like glowing coals in the dark gloom of the priests. For if these latter had been shining in their life like the sun, the glow of the coals would have been imperceptible, they would have been put out by the clearer light. But when the cloak and the garment of the priesthood alone was left among men, and the gift of the Spirit passed to the monks and was displayed by signs showing that they had attained the life of the apostles by their deeds, then again the devil wrought his own work. For seeing them displayed again to the world as new disciples of Christ and shining forth in their life and their marvels, he introduced his false apostles and private devices and mingled them with the monks. So little by little the monks multiplied, as thou seest, and became useless and quite unworthy of their name.

So then the power to forgive sins has been given by God neither to monks wearing the habit, nor to those who have been ordained and picked out for the rank of priesthood, nor to those

who have been honoured by the dignity of the high priesthood, I mean patriarchs and metropolitans and bishops, (14) simply because of ordination alone and the honour attaching to it—away with the idea, for to offer sacrifice only has been granted them, and I think many of them had not even this, lest being grass they should be burnt up thereby. No, it has been granted only to those to whom among priests and high priests and monks it belongs to be numbered among the bands of Christ's disciples because of their holiness.

15. [How shall such men recognize the gift in themselves and others recognize it in them? Scriptural tests: Mk. xvi. 17 *f.*; Jn. x. 27; Mt. vii. 16, 20; Gal. v. 22; 1 Cor. xii. 8-11; Mt. v. 14, 15.] And why do I lengthen my discourse saying these many obvious things? If each of the aforesaid finds that he has attained every virtue which one hears read out from the holy Scriptures, and in like manner has performed every good act, and in regard to each has recognized its progression, variation and rank, and is uplifted to the height of the divine glory —then let him know that he has become partaker of God and His gifts, and he shall be known by those that see well and even by the dim-sighted. And so such may say to all with boldness: "We are ambassadors on behalf of Christ as though God was beseeching you through us, Be ye reconciled to God." For all such have kept the commandments of God unto death, sold their goods and distributed to the poor, followed Christ by enduring temptations, lost their own souls for the love of God in this world and found them unto life eternal. But finding their own souls they found them in light intellectual, and so in this light they saw the light unapproachable, God Himself, according to the Scripture "In thy light shall we see light." How then is it possible for a man to find his soul? Attend: The soul of each is the coin which was lost, not by God, but by each one of us plunging himself into the darkness of sin. But Christ having come as the true light, and meeting those that seek Him, as He himself alone knows how, granted them to see Himself. For this finding one's soul is seeing God, and in His light becoming higher than every visible creature, and having God as shepherd and teacher, from whom one will know how to bind and loose, and having known accurately one will adore the Giver and impart to them that desire.

16. To such, my son, I know has been given the authority to bind and loose from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit, those who are His sons by adoption

and His holy servants. Of such a man was I myself a disciple, a father with no ordination from men; but by the hand or rather the Spirit of God He chose me out for discipleship and bade me receive ordination from men because of the honourable stamp which follows it, when I had for a long while been stirred by the Holy Spirit to this end with vehement longing.

17. Wherefore, brethren and fathers, let us first pray that we may become like these men, and then let us discourse to others concerning freedom from passions and the reception of rational arguments, and let us seek such a spiritual father. Let us by preference seek laboriously such men as are true disciples of Christ and with toil of heart and many tears for a stated period of days supplicate God that He may open the eyes of our hearts to know where such a one in this evil generation may be found. Then having found him we shall receive forgiveness of our sins through him, obeying his precepts and commands with all our soul, just as he, having heard Christ's commands, has become partaker of His grace and His gifts, and received from Him authority to bind and loose sins, inflamed by the Holy Spirit, to Whom belongs all glory, honour, and worship with the Father and the only begotten Son for ever. Amen.

III

No purpose is served by trying to treat as one and the same institution the official excommunication and reconciliation of notorious sinners at the hands of the bishop, and the custom by which scrupulous souls sought the ministrations of holy men whether lay or cleric. Though the two streams are united in the modern Sacrament of Penance, in origin they are distinct. Certainly the latter is not a perverted type of the former. Let us now study its beginnings and history.

That informal confession, referred to in St. James' " Confess your sins one to another," existed from the first, may be safely assumed; also that confession was normally made to those best qualified to deal with souls. But for our purpose it is sufficient to start with Clement of Alexandria. All the essentials of the later monk, the spiritual father or " man of God " who heard confessions, are found in Clement's picture of the Gnostic. " He who has first moderated his passions and trained himself for impassivity, and developed to the beneficence of gnostic

perfection, is here equal to the angels" (*Strom.*, vi. 13). Impassivity (ἀπάθεια) is a technical term in Greek monasticism; so is "angelic life." "Those who have exercised themselves in the Lord's commandments, and lived perfectly and gnostically according to the gospel, may be enrolled in the perfect body of the apostles. Such an one is in reality a presbyter of the Church, and a true minister (deacon) of the will of God, if he do and teach what is the Lord's; not as being ordained by men, nor regarded righteous because a presbyter, but enrolled in the presbyterate because righteous" (*ibid.*). We have been advised recently to give the phrase "charismatic ministry" a rest, but rightly understood it would be useful to describe what is in Clement's mind. The monks of Egypt were conscious athletes, striving for the mastery and to break records in the conflicts of asceticism: "This [the Gnostic] is the true athlete—he who . . . is crowned for the true victory over all the passions" (*Strom.*, vii. 3). The Gnostic is "the friend of God" (another technical monastic word). "Request for the conversion of our neighbours is the function of the Gnostic." His prayers are granted (vii. 7). In vii. 11 we have Clement's opinion of those who, in foolhardy fashion, rush into martyrdom. "No one who is irrationally brave is a Gnostic," he says, and proceeds to show that the Gnostic, willing to suffer, but not pushing himself forward, is the true martyr. The association of ideas by which the monk succeeded the martyr is perfectly clear. The Gnostic is in all essentials the later monk: the Gnostic is also the true martyr: the monk also is the martyr. The following passage (vii. 12) illustrates the pastoral activity of the Gnostic: "Praying that he may get a share in the sins of his brethren, with a view to confession and conversion on the part of his kindred."

Origen taught that he who would forgive sins must be spiritual himself, having received the Spirit like the apostles; only such a one can heal according to the mind of God (*de Orat.*, 28). The power of binding and loosing varies in proportion to the spiritual gifts of him who exercises it.[1] "The gates . . . of hell must not control him who wishes to bind and loose; but

[1] ὅσῳ οὖν βελτίων ὁ δεσμεύων, τοσοῦτον μακαριώτατος ὁ λελυμένος. (*In Matt.*, tom. xiii., chap. 31.)

if he is bound with the cords of his sins, in vain he both binds and looses" (*In Matt.*, tom. xii., ch. xiv.). In the second homily on Leviticus, chapter iv., Origen refers to a sinner's disclosing his sin to "a priest of the Lord," and seeking medicine. But in the second homily on Psalm xxxvii., he bids the sinner seek out a soul doctor with care and testing.[1] The qualifications which he enumerates are personal, and not official. It would seem that the choice is theoretically from the whole body of Christians, but for practical purposes there was as yet no body of men other than priests whose help one would be likely to seek, so that in the passage quoted above the recipient of confessions is called a priest.

IV

The Epistle of the Church of Vienne and Lyons, preserved by Eusebius,[2] vividly illustrates the estimation in which the martyrs were held in the last part of the second century. The martyrs were athletes, contending in the lists against the devil. In them the sufferings of Christ, mystically united with His Church, were renewed. "Christ, suffering in him [Sanctus] manifested His glory, delivering him from his adversary." Of Pothinus it is said: "Though his body was worn out by old age and disease, his life was preserved that Christ might triumph in it. When he was brought by the soldiers to the tribunal, accompanied by the civil magistrates and a multitude who shouted against him in every manner as if he were Christ Himself, he bore noble witness." Requests made to a martyr shortly before his death had every chance of being granted. Would he not be admitted into the immediate presence of his King? and would anything be denied to the faithful servant? So a martyr's assistance was sought by those who were disheartened by the rigour of the official system. But martyr meant one who had been tormented for the faith, whether fatally or not, and the extension of his prerogatives to the confessor was easy and natural. The extraordinary claims of

[1] Tantummodo circumspice diligentius, cui debeas confiteri peccatum tuum. Proba prius medicum. . . . Multa hoc deliberatione et satis perito medici illius consilio procurandum est.

[2] *H. E.*, v. 1.

the confessors in the times of Cyprian to wield the disciplinary powers of the Church are too well known to need description. Probably the mystical identification of the martyrs with the suffering Christ was the most potent element in the growth of their prestige.

In the Apostolic Constitutions we read: " A confessor is not ordained; for he is so by choice and patience, and is worthy of great honour, as having confessed the name of God, and of His Christ, before nations and kings " (viii. 23). The Constitutions are an ideal reconstruction, but must have been sufficiently true to the customs of the third and fourth century to render their attribution to the apostles plausible; that contemporary practice was loyal to apostolic tradition no one would have doubted.

Broadly speaking, after 252 the powers of the martyrs and confessors in the West were shattered, but for a considerable time honour was paid to them. In the East the ascetic development of the fourth century overshadowed all else, and the monks became heirs to the positions occupied by the martyrs, Clement's Gnostic and Origen's spiritual physician. An interesting passage in Athanasius' *Life of Antony* reflects the change in ideas. During the persecution of 303-311 Antony went to Alexandria. " And he longed to suffer martyrdom, but not being willing to give himself up, he ministered to the confessors in the mines and in the prisons. . . . He prayed to be a martyr, wherefore he seemed as one grieved that he had not borne his witness. . . . When at last the persecution ceased . . . Antony departed, and again withdrew to his cell, and was there daily a martyr to his conscience, and contending in the conflicts of faith " (46, 47). We seem to hear Athanasius saying, " Behold the martyr of these days." The arena in which these martyrs contended is described by Cassian: Antony's " followers are rightly termed anchorites, that is, withdrawers, because, being by no means satisfied with that victory whereby they had trodden under foot the hidden snares of the devil, while still living among men, they were eager to fight with the devils in open conflict and a straightforward battle, and so feared not to penetrate the vast recesses of the desert " (*Coll.*, xviii. 6).

V

The vague ideas of the age were summed up in the personality of St. Antony, which in its turn was a model for further developments. St. Augustine, for example, was "amazed to hear that so lately, and almost in our own days, such wonderful things had been wrought by Thee" (*Conf.*, viii. 6). Countless Christians modelled their conduct on that of Antony. Not only was he visited in the desert by those who wanted spiritual help, but he himself set the example of "zealous amendment of the whole life," and awoke in many a tender conscience scruples which could only be stilled by confession. His instructions to the monks who sought his guidance are very modern in tone. Systematic self-examination is enjoined, with special reference to the discipline of thoughts. The keeping of a spiritual diary is actually recommended. "As a safeguard against sin let the following be observed. Let us each one note and write down our actions and the impulses of our soul as though we were going to relate them to each other" (55).

VI

St. Basil's works are indispensable to the student of fourth-century confession. On the one hand, he was called upon as bishop to administer the official Church system in the highly developed form which prevailed in Asia Minor, whereby the period of penance varied according to the offence; see the "*Canonical*" *Epistles to Amphilochius* (188, 199, 217). On the other hand, he made confession as a means of grace a regular practice in his monasteries. The two things are quite distinct, and there is no sign of his having brought them into connection one with the other.

We must recall the traditional classification of sins: (i.) sins unto death—*i.e.*, idolatry, impurity, and murder, which, in early times, were left to the mercy of God, but were brought within the scope of reconciliation, at least in the West, after the Novatianist schism of 252; (ii.) ordinary serious sins, which were the subject of confession; (iii.) venial sins, which seem to have been practically ignored by the rank and file in the

third century. Now Basil's treatise, *On the Judgment of God*, which to a hasty reading merely enunciates platitudes, becomes a document of great importance when we reconstruct its background. It is largely autobiographical. Basil describes his upbringing amid conventional ideas. Then, on his reaching man's estate, the scales fell from his eyes. He realized that God's inexorable judgment is pronounced upon all sins, however small they may seem to us, and that omission is equivalent to commission. At the same time God's mercy is boundless.[1] By this simplification he extended the subject-matter of confession in both directions, by including both sins unto death and venial offences. When we remember that Basil became the spiritual father of unnumbered thousands during his own and the following generations, we see the importance of his discovery. The great spiritual experience to which he refers in *On the Judgment of God*, a period of darkness followed by illumination, can be none other than his conversion, which took place soon after he returned to Cæsarea from Athens in 356. His first step was to visit Egypt, the fountain head of Monasticism, and see the holy men of that country for himself. During this period, which coincided approximately with the year 357, he came into close contact with the ideas preserved to us in the *Life of Antony*. We suspect that the teaching of Origen, if not already familiar to him, became so at this time. The suspicion becomes a certainty when we find Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus making a selection of passages from Origen (the *Philocalia*) shortly after Basil's return home.

Basil's Longer and Shorter Rules inculcate systematic and frequent confession as a necessary part of the common life. If the implications of a life lived together are followed up, everything, including the hidden things of the heart, must be shared with one's fellows. Confession is to be made to the Superior, or to one of a class of Superiors or seniors within the monastery.[2]

[1] *De Iudicio* and Shorter Rules, 4, 13, 15.

[2] These are called either προεστῶτες or πρεσβύτεροι, and are monks who possess the necessary charisma. πρεσβύτεροι cannot=priests, for (i.) when Basil speaks of a priest in the monastery he uses ἱερεύς, (ii.) a sister confesses to a πρεσβύτερος in the presence of a πρεσβυτέρα. The πρεσβύτερος, therefore, was one who had a counterpart in the sisterhood, and must be translated " senior."

In one passage only is there any suggestion that a priest is to hear confessions. In the 288th Shorter Rule " those who are entrusted with the administration of the mysteries of God " are mentioned. But an informal reference to 1 Cor. iv. 1 must not be pressed. Besides, Basil proceeds to refer to John the Baptist[1] as one of those so entrusted, and the Baptist was the typical ascetic and desert-dweller, not a priest.[2]

VII

The combination in Basil of monk and bishop is of great significance. To this day bishops in the Eastern Church are chosen from the ranks of the monks, not from the married parish priests. From the days of Basil onwards, Greek monasticism was brought into the service of the Church. Not that any anti-hierarchical tendencies are to be detected before his date. Early monasticism was a lay movement, but the monks were always loyal in principle to ecclesiastical organization; they honoured the priesthood, but avoided it as an exercise in humility.

We have said enough to show how natural it was for the laity to open their griefs to those of the monks who had spiritual gifts and were able, like wise physicians, to cure the diseases of souls. Basil's instructions are designed for the monks, but he frequently refers to visitors who came for edification. Further, he set up his cenobia in the towns, so that the spread of confession to the laity outside the monasteries needs no explanation. But why did the East develop so differently from the West? and how did the Eastern monks come to claim *exclusive* privileges during the period 900-1200? The following considerations, though not a complete answer to these questions, will remove some of the perplexity which arises in the mind of the English reader.

[1] *Cf.* the occurrence of John the Baptist in the modern *Confiteor.*

[2] See my *St. Basil the Great* (1913) for a treatment of this subject. Various Roman Catholic reviewers said, Yes, *confession* may have been made to those who were not priests, but *absolution* was not given. The criticism is beside the mark, for no *Ego absoluo te* is known before the thirteenth century. In the fully developed theory of confession taught by Simeon the New Theologian, the monk—whether priest or layman—has the power of binding and loosing.

1. Monasticism originated in the East, where it was the heir to many of the spiritual ideals of the second and third centuries. In the West it was an importation, and hardly native to the soil until it had been refashioned by St. Benedict. But St. Benedict was a thorough Roman, and naturally impressed a Roman stamp upon the movement. To him, as to others of his mental presuppositions, much that was natural in the East would have seemed sheer lawlessness. But in Celtic monasticism, the exponents of which were far removed from Rome mentally as well as geographically, Eastern features reappeared. It is tempting to try to trace their connection with the East through Latin translations of Eastern rules, or perhaps through the Rhone valley with its Greek traditions. But the common features are probably the natural expression of the ideas of asceticism, where they have not been modified by the Roman genius.

2. East and West differ in their conception of the Spirit. The East rejects the *Filioque*, but insists on the Epiclesis in the Eucharist. So as regards confession. The West regards the Spirit as a gift bestowed upon the Church once and for all in the days of the apostles, which is now dispensed through the proper channels of grace. Who but priests, then, should hear confessions and convey the assurance of pardon? The Greeks, thinking of the Holy Ghost as descending upon the elements at each celebration of the Eucharist, and to be invoked afresh on each occasion, sought out πνευματόφοροι, men unmistakably filled with the Holy Ghost, when they needed spiritual help. And according to the ideas of their day, the monks, in whom alone the charismata of apostolic times were to be found, were such men as they required.

3. The theories of Dionysius the Areopagite had a great influence. He taught that the taking of the monastic habit was a sacrament or mystery. It was described as "second baptism." As baptism remitted sins for ordinary people, so becoming a monk gave entry into a higher life (βίος ἀγγελικός) of perfect penitence. Clearly, then, a monk was the most suitable man to deal with problems of sin and its remission, seeing that he was the ideal penitent.

4. The special favour in which the monks were regarded

during the period 900-1200 is in part to be explained by their attitude towards the Iconoclastic controversy. The secular priesthood was largely on the side of the persecuting emperors, the monks took the opposite side. With the triumph of the icons the monks came into popular favour. The original idea that they had succeeded to the prerogatives of the martyrs was reinforced by their brave endurance of persecutions during the ninth century.

5. Perhaps the most potent cause of all is the simple fact that secular priests in the East were married, monks unmarried. Even in our own day practical difficulties arise in the minds of some regarding confession to married priests. In an age when no one had any doubt about the higher rank of the celibate, the secular priest must have seemed an unsuitable person to be a father-confessor.

The result of our investigation is this: There were two forms of penitence in the early Church—the official Church discipline, for which the bishop was responsible, a discipline reserved for serious offences and normally not exercised in the case of an individual more than once in a lifetime; and the seeking by tender consciences of a physician of the soul, who was in the East generally a monk, whether cleric or lay being immaterial. The modern Sacrament of Penance cannot be found in any recognizable form in primitive times. In so far as the bishop is ultimately responsible, his authority being normally exercised by the parish priest, the original official system, the restoration of which is referred to in the Commination Service of the Book of Common Prayer as much to be desired, may be said to persist. But for practical purposes confession to-day represents the healing of sick souls by a competent physician endued with the power of binding and loosing so carefully practised by the Greek monks. This state of affairs vividly illustrates the impossibility of returning to the primitive Church. In the course of centuries a far more workable method has been developed than any known to the early Church. But much can be learned from the Greeks. A minister who takes upon himself to administer the official system must never forget that equipment of the Spirit and knowledge of a wise physician of souls,

without which the Greek monk would not have dared to hear confessions. And he who aspires to train souls cannot afford to neglect the Greek ascetical and mystical writers, in particular those who are most firmly based on the New Testament, and who made their contribution before Dionysius the Areopagite had troubled the stream.[1]

Additional Note

To round off the foregoing study I add a summary of a recent book on Confession to Laymen in the Western Church, Fr. Teetaert's *La Confession aux Laïques dans l'église Latine depuis le viii^e jusqu'au xiv^e siècle* (Bruges, Beyaert, 1926). It runs to 500 pages and gives all the information students are likely to want. Most candidly the writer acknowledges the extraordinary divergence of practice in different ages of the Church, and concludes that " the continuity and immutability of the dogma are preserved by the universal and perpetual admission of the principle that the reconciliation of the sinner with God is certain only through the Church "—a formula which has eirenic qualities. As we study his pages and note the skill and sympathy with which the Church met the varying needs of successive generations we shall be less than ever disposed to accept " the corrupt following of the Apostles " as a possible description of the theoretical penitential system that confronted the Reformers. H. Lea in his *History of Auricular Confession* took the decrees of the fourth Lateran Council (1215) to be an imposing of the clerical yoke, and confession to laymen to be a survival of primitive practice. The facts do not support his position.

The Western and Eastern practices had different roots. In the West we must distinguish three stages: (*a*) public penance; (*b*) " tariffed penance," by which the Church imposed on the Germanic tribes a scale of penances corresponding to the

[1] Cassian, whose *Conferences* are a repertory of the experience of the Egyptian monks, may be counted as a Greek for this purpose. Macarius' *Homilies* (translated by A. J. Mason) are a rich mine of ascetical theology. *The Ascetic Works of St. Basil* consist almost entirely of applications of Scripture to the problems of the spiritual life (see my edition).

Wergeld, to which they were accustomed in secular life; (*c*) a third and final stage when absolution emerged as the main factor and satisfaction retired into the background. Detailed confession came in at the second stage, to enable penalties to be assigned. It is important to notice the part played by the monks. In their own community life they practised (*a*) the *culpa*, or accusation of themselves before the brethren and (*b*) confession to the Superior, for the purposes of *direction*. In the early Middle Ages monks played an important part in the evangelization of the West. They naturally urged the people to practise the discipline to which they themselves were accustomed. This originated the practice of confessing to laymen. Bede's teaching was widely influential, that sin was cured by the prayers of the faithful, who must therefore know the state of those for whom they prayed. But up to the tenth century the emphasis was on penance rather than on confession. As penalties became milder, stress was laid on the humiliation involved in confessing—*erubescentia* was the technical word. (No one ever held that any but a priest had the power of the keys.) So important was this held to be that, in the absence of a priest, it was thought not only desirable but necessary to confess to a layman. The twelfth century Canonists urge that in such cases grave as well as venial sins should be confessed; a general practice was to confess venial sins to a layman, grave ones to a priest. They were much influenced by the teaching of Ps. Augustine, *De vera et falsa Poenitentia*. The first scholastics taught that absolution was necessary as well as confession. St. Thomas was the first theologian to combine effectively the subjective element of contrition with the objective element of absolution. He no longer takes contrition as the main part of the ordinance and as conferring pardon, but teaches that the sacramental value comes from the priestly minister. Taking this view, which prevailed in later centuries,[1] he seems inconsistent in allowing and even commending confession to laymen in certain cases. But his position was quite logical. Confession to laymen was firmly entrenched in practice, and he had to deal sympathetic-

[1] Though perfect contrition has always been held to produce forgiveness at once.

ally with it. The penitent who, a priest not being available, confessed to a layman was doing all in his power and proving his *desire* for a priest's ministrations. In common estimation Baptism and Penance were closely connected, being two Sacraments conveying remission of sins. Since the services of a layman were necessary in an emergency to obtain Baptism, so were they in the case of Penance.

In conclusion, three points may be mentioned.

1. The problem was universally recognized as pressing. Our forefathers took their sins very seriously and in this respect were an example to us.

2. The continual references to the absence of a priest, in an age when a large proportion of the population was in Holy Orders, are very remarkable. We can only conclude that war was looked on as the normal occupation of mankind.

3. Even a cursory study of the problem is of devotional value. The modern priest confessing to laymen in the *Praeparatio* is the heir to a millennial tradition. From the days of St. James through the monks to the Middle Ages and then on to our own times runs the precious tradition of the part played by confession to the laity in deepening the contrition of the penitent.

XX

THE MANDAEANS[1]

IN Southern Mesopotamia, up to about 1880 at least, some pathetic fragments of a Gnostic sect survived, Mandaeans by name. (*Mandā d'hayyē* means "*knowledge of life*"; Manda was called into existence by "the Great Māna of Glory," and is an intermediary between the Supreme One and the world—in some places he is identified with Jesus Christ.)

This sect has suddenly come into the foreground of New Testament research. Their literature is at last available to the ordinary scholar. It is written in a Semitic language akin to Aramaic, with a peculiar script; a grammar of the language by Nöldeke has been published. The three books have all been edited and translated into German by M. Lidzbarski. "The Book of John" was published in 1915; it is a record of supposed sayings and doings of the Baptist and his disciples. The Qŏlastā or Liturgies followed in 1920. In 1925 the vast Ginza or Treasure House, sometimes called the Mandaean Bible, appeared. It is divided into two halves, the *right* and the *left*, dealing with the living and the dead. A convenient method of reference is GR and GL.

Lidzbarski's views deserve to be treated respectfully, if critically. They may be summarized very briefly thus. "Jordan-baptism" is the characteristic rite of Mandaeism, that is, a weekly ceremonial washing in running water, which is

[1] *Ginza: Das Grosse Buch der Mandäer.* Translated and edited by M. Lidzbarski. Göttingen, 1925.

Mandaean Studies. By S. A. Pallis. Oxford, 1926.

Other works on which this sketch is based are the article "Mandaeans" by W. Brandt in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*; articles by R. Bultmann, "Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums," and by E. Peterson, "Bemerkungen zur mandäischen Literatur," in the *Z.N.T.W.*, 1925, pp. 100 *ff.*, and 1926, 236 *ff.*, respectively.

always called "Jordan." The first example we have of a special sanctity attached to Jordan is 1 Kings v., where Naaman is bidden wash therein. In Mark i. the water has power to wash away sins. The three primitive heroes of the Mandaeans are Adam, Eve and Abel; Cain being unknown. Presumably the Jewish legends were shared with surrounding nations, and a portion only of a considerable mythology has survived in the Old Testament. The beginnings of Mandaeism are surely pre-Christian. Persecutions at the hands of the Jews, referred to in the Ginza, could hardly have arisen in Babylonia. Rather the Mandaeans originated at a time when the Jews were in power and persecuted heterodox movements. The name Jordan shows that the Mandaeans began in the neighbourhood of that river and emigrated to Babylonia, perhaps because of the abundant supply of water in that land. They were violently opposed to the Babylonian star-worship; also to Ruhā, *i.e.*, the (Holy) Spirit, who (feminine in Semitic languages) in these writings reminds us of *Dea Syra*. The connection with Christianity must be early, going back to its very beginning. The fact that the Mandaeans call themselves Nazoraeans is significant. The writings as they now exist arose for the most part in pre-Islamic times, but were codified under pressure of Islam, that the sect might be recognized with favour as "people of a book."

Certain German scholars have lost no time in using these results. Bauer in the new edition of his commentary on St. John in Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum N.T.* has introduced a great many illustrative passages from Mandaean documents. Professor Bultmann of Marburg has worked out the connection of St. John and Mandaeism in detail.[1] The Fourth Gospel (he urges) up to now is an unsolved problem. It is not based on Hellenistic speculation nor on Palestinian Judaism as generally understood. It has affinities with the Hermetic literature, but the absence of polemic against the Old Testament and of any teaching about the demiurge or æons prevents our calling it Gnostic. It is now seen to be based on an Oriental mythology, the root idea of which is as follows. The soul, imprisoned on earth, is rescued by a heaven-sent Revealer.

[1] *Z.N.T.W.*, 1925, pp. 100*ff.*

A parallel conception is that of the *Urmensch* (archetypal Man), imprisoned in matter, whose fate typifies that of the individual soul. Bultmann works out exhaustively the parallels. Here are a few.

> Jn. xvii. 21: That the world may believe that thou hast sent me.
>
> Ginza R. ii. 64 (p. 58): The Sent of the Light am I, whom the Great One has sent into this world.

> Jn. xvii. 2: Thou gavest him authority over all flesh.
>
> Ginza R. iii. 73 (p. 70): The Great One has . . . given thee authority over everything.

> Jn. viii. 12: I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in the darkness, but shall have the light of life.
>
> Ginza R. v. 3 (p. 182): Mandā d'hayyē revealed himself to all the children of men and saves them from darkness to light, from obscurity to the light of life.

It is " extraordinarily probable " that the origin of Mandaeism is the religious sect which arose from the activity of John the Baptist, and is presupposed by the polemics of the Fourth Gospel. Ναζωραῖος, the name by which the Mandaeans described themselves, probably means " Observant," and was applied to Jesus because He belonged to such a circle of " Observanten," or keepers of a religious rule. There were two elements in primitive Palestinian Christianity, one represented by the Synoptic Gospels, the other (? akin to the Essenes) strongly influenced by the Oriental mythology of heterodox sects on the fringe of Judaism.[1]

Reitzenstein's theories are well known. The Heavenly Man myth was widely accepted in the countries round Palestine and had pressed into Judaism. He claims his chief support in the Mandaean literature. Jesus was recognized by his disciples as " the Man," and with this recognition came in the *mythos* which eventually took shape as the Creed.[2]

Now all this is enormously important if true. On the one hand the transcendental side of Christianity would be obviously

[1] It is interesting to note yet another attempt, from an unexpected quarter, to plant the Fourth Gospel on Palestinian soil.

[2] See *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium* (1921).

part of the original faith, dating back to our Lord's ministry; on the other, the origin of the most precious part of our religion would be a heterodox fringe of Judaism, strongly influenced by Persian beliefs !

It is almost incredible that the theory should be argued so confidently when the earliest Mandaean MS. is dated 1560. But it will be well at this point to give a few extracts from the Ginza.

> He is the high King of light, the Lord of all Worlds of Light, the High One above all Uthras [angels] . . . the King of kings, the great Lord above all things . . . He is the light, in whom is no darkness. G.R. i. 9, 10 (p. 6).
>
> The sun goes not down before him, the lights of his city are never extinguished. G.R. i. 25 (p. 9).
>
> They hunger and thirst not, and heat and cold . . . are not with them. G.R. i. 50 (p. 12).
>
> Love not gold and silver and the possessions of this world. For this world passeth away. G.R. ii. 30 (p. 35).
>
> They [the Christians] left their houses and became monks and nuns. G.R. ii 145 (p. 50).
>
> Give alms to the poor and be a guide to the blind. When you give alms, mine elect, testify it not. . . . If you give with your right hand, tell it not to your left. If you give with your left hand, tell it not to your right. G.R. i. 104 (p. 17).

These instances are enough to show that the references to Christianity are late and that the parallels are reminiscences of New Testament passages. Before we proceed further two more extracts will serve to show the character of the Ginza.

> After the Arabian Mahammad, the son of Bizbat, will no prophet again come into the world. G.R. ii. 164 (p. 54).

From the left part, the Book of the Dead, G.L. p. 549.

> In at the door of the prisoners did I pass,
> My splendour arose over their prison.
> Over their prison arose my splendour,
> And through my fragrancy they became sweet smelling.
> Through my fragrancy they became sweet smelling,
> And Sheol was enlightened by my splendour.

The souls perceived it,
  There they are weeping and wailing and shedding tears.
I call to the keeper of the prisoners,
  " Open the door for the Souls."
To which he said,
  " How many should I let out of a thousand,
How many should I let out of ten thousand ?"

* * * * *

The souls were separated
  From the place of darkness to the place of light.
And Life is victorious.

This is a beautiful description of the Harrowing of Hell, and there is much in the same vein. But the Ginza as a whole is an almost inconceivable medley of good and bad—the aspirations of pious souls mingled with bitter charges against rival religions, faded myths, Gnostic absurdities, and the like. It shows a completely unhistorical mind, when a few passages are selected as important evidence for the origin of Christianity and the mass of the documents is freely acknowledged to be late. The error is akin to that of Jewish scholars who declare that the Sermon on the Mount is all to be found in the Talmud, without candidly adding: ' And how much else besides !"

Clearly pioneer investigators are intoxicated with the new wine of their discoveries and more sober scholars must be called in to correct their exaggerations. E. Peterson has answered many of Lidzbarski's points.[1] That the Mandaeans term all flowing water Jordan does not prove their Palestinian origin; in Syriac hymns and the Jacobite baptismal rite all water in which one is baptized is called Jordan. The position of Abel in Mandaeism is said to spring from similar tales in nations which were neighbours to the Jews; but there is no evidence of such tales, and the Mandaean Abel may well be caused by *gnosis*, embroidering reminiscences of the Biblical story. The expectation that Jerusalem will be destroyed is said to point to a date before A.D. 70; but Jerusalem may be used, as in Gnostic sources, to mean the bad æon.

Useful as Peterson's article is, we must turn to *Mandaean*

[1] See *Z.N.T.W.*, 1926, 236*ff.*

Studies, by S. A. Pallis, a Danish scholar, for the antidote to these wild theories. It is difficult reading, but forms an indispensable companion to Lidzbarski and Reitzenstein. Mandaeism is treated as a department of Babylonian religion; its relations to Persia, Judaism and Gnosticism are carefully discussed, but this very learned scholar only incidentally finds it necessary to discuss Christianity. He concludes his opening arguments by saying that " all the central ideas of the Mand-religion: the cosmology, world-process, the baptism, the doctrines of the soul's journey after death and of the inhabitation of the planets by demons—all these things pointed towards an influence from the Persian religion or from Gnosticism; on the other hand no single point showed affinity with Judaism." The later strata, especially, of the documents show an infiltration of Christian influence. There is nothing to prove a movement in the reverse direction (p. 115). Jewish elements, he now proves, have come in through Islamic Arabic literature. Finally a comparison with Gnosticism shows that " in its very essence, the outlook on life and the cult, the Mandaean religion was typically Gnostic, and also, that we were right when speaking above of a Gnostic stratum in Mandaeism. Indeed . . . as regards the cult Mandaeism is the best known Gnostic system, for our knowledge of other Gnostic sects is limited to their speculative myths."

This common-sense conclusion will be generally welcomed as settling the matter for the present. Theoretically it remains possible that certain elements incorporated in the Mandaean literature are pre-Christian and therefore must be reckoned with in a study of Christian origins. But the improbability is such that for practical purposes we can ignore it, and we certainly need not waste our time in filling our note-books with Mandaean parallels to the Fourth Gospel.

XXIII

MAY WE EXPECT A RELIGIOUS REVIVAL?

I

TO such a question there are two usual answers, the answer of faith and that of materialism. The believer is quite certain that he holds a treasure which the world is sure to appreciate eventually. He appeals to the promises of our Lord, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church, and that He will be with His faithful always. He is content to tarry the Lord's leisure, knowing that the Spirit bloweth where He listeth, and that man may dig channels for divine grace but cannot control the flow of the living waters. The vision may be for many days yet, but he never wavers in his conviction that in the end it will be assured fact.

But such convictions are powerless to influence the materialist, who sees a steady receding of the tide of faith. His reading of the situation differs completely. The world, in his view, is steadily becoming more secular. Each wave of temporary religious revival reaches less far up the shore, each retreat of the wave leaves a larger stretch of indifference revealed.

Is it possible to decide between these two readings of the same facts? Probably not, so long as the believer relies on an interior conviction which the scientific observer refuses to accept as evidence, and the latter confines his attention to a relatively short stretch of human history. That history, within limits, repeats itself is common ground. Where the materialist is mistaken is in his impression that we are confronted with an entirely novel situation upon which the past throws no light. There are solid grounds in history for thinking that our present scientific age will be succeeded by one in which men's interests are largely religious—to use Professor Eddington's phrase, one in which preoccupation with what can be *measured* yields to interest in all the concerns of the Spirit that defy measurement.

II

The world of scholars is only now beginning to do justice to the splendid achievements of what may fairly be called the first great age of science, that of the three Hellenistic centuries from the death of Alexander in 323 to the establishment of the Roman Empire by Augustus in 31 B.C. After Alexander's conquests the restless Greek mind, unable to employ itself profitably in politics now that the City State was overshadowed by the new imperialism, turned to research into the secrets of Nature. There followed a series of brilliant discoveries made by pure brain power without the aid of instruments. Here are some of them.

Kidenas, a Babylonian, calculated the length of the year correctly within seven minutes,[1] and is even thought to have discovered the precession of the equinoxes. Aristarchus of Samos held that the earth and the planets went round the sun, the fixed stars being an enormous distance away. To Hipparchus of Nicea, if not to Kidenas, must be ascribed the credit of discovering the precession of the equinoxes. Poseidonius' reckoning of the sun's distance from the earth was about five-eighths of the true figure. Euclid wrote a book of geometry which was used in our schools up to a few years ago. Archimedes' feats became a legend; among them were the compound pulley and the endless screw. Eratosthenes of Cyrene, on the basis of the distance from Alexandria to Syene, calculated the circumference of the earth as 24,662 miles, the actual figure being 24,857. Geographers discovered that the moon caused the tides, and that you could sail round Africa. The existence of America was surmised. Herophilus of Chalcedon found out the circulation of the blood, lost again till Harvey. The Hellenistic age clearly trembled on the verge of an application of theory to practice which would have antedated the modern scientific age by 2000 years. Why it failed to take the necessary steps is difficult to say with cer-

[1] That the year was not 365¼ days was neglected till the Gregorian calendar. This paragraph is summarized from W. W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilization.*

tainty. The Greek system of numerals must have been a stern barrier to the general diffusion of knowledge; only to a very small extent was attention paid to the devising of instruments wherewith to harness the forces of Nature; and nothing comparable with our modern system of scientific organization, by which a host of scientific workers co-operate, seems to have existed. But other and deeper causes were also at work.

Man is so made that he cannot attend to more than one thing at once. Rhythm is a law of his nature, perhaps imposed on his mental habits by the impact of day and night, summer and winter, even the moon's changes, upon countless generations of his human and pre-human ancestors. With the coming of the Christian era Rome, as mistress of the world, impressed her genius upon the Eastern Mediterranean, and practice rather than theory became fashionable. But more fundamental was the impulse affecting the best minds to study religion rather than science. The loss was great. For example, that the achievements of Greek medicine were neglected, and faith-healing and magic drove out accurate diagnosis, was doubtless deplorable. But on the whole the shifting of emphasis was salutary. Greek science had been the pursuit of the few: the renewed study of conduct benefited the many. Conduct is at least three-fourths of life. That St. Paul, brooding over the example and teaching of Jesus, wrote 1 Cor. xiii. has meant more to the world than all the discoveries of astronomy. If we must choose between religion and science, religion is the more valuable.

III

The long sway of religion lasted until the sixteenth century. Not that the average man was any more religious in the Middle Ages than he is now. Probably the devout and the downright wicked form a fairly stable proportion of the population in all ages. But the multitudes in between the two extremes, now naïvely irreligious, were then naïvely religious. Then, as now, their outlook was coloured by the teaching of the

leading spirits of the age. In the sixteenth century the closed system of Europe was broken down.[1] Europe had been like a medieval walled town; there was a little hole in the East through which such things as silk and spices trickled, but in the main it was self-contained and closed. In a generation or two new worlds opened out, frontiers were rolled back, first Asia then America came into view, the world was circumnavigated, and—the frontiers of time also receding—the ancient world with its learning and science was recovered.

In the stress of theological controversy we tend to forget what we really know well. The sixteenth century originated the modern world. But its main historical importance, as Mr. Tawney has shown so brilliantly, is that it witnessed the beginning of secularism, the modern State, business organization, and the like. To attribute any special sacredness to its religious decisions is impossible for the historically minded. Indeed, Methodists are on far firmer ground when they appeal to the Methodist Revival of the eighteenth century than Anglicans can ever be in appealing to an " Elizabethan Settlement " as settling any really religious issues.

We do not forget the Counter-Reformation and the classics of Protestantism. But they came rather later. The Abbé Bremond set out to tell the story of French religious thought " down to our own days." After eight great volumes he is still in the seventeenth century. But for his purpose the religious revival of the end of the sixteenth century is to be reckoned with the seventeenth century. And in England the really religious movement is definitely seventeenth century. Where in Elizabeth's reign can we find characters with the savour of Bunyan and Mrs. Hutchinson on the one side, or of George Herbert and Nicholas Ferrar on the other? Probably the materialistic historian would say that the pace had been too hot to last, so that a reaction from secularism to medieval standards of devotion was inevitable. In any case, secularism soon resumed its sway. After the " religious wars " priest and minister alike were made to understand that they must not interfere with statecraft or business, and the secularist State

[1] See Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism.*

went on to ever greater triumphs. Science and discovery have progressed with hardly a check, and at the present time the acceleration is more marked than ever.

IV

Now it is curious to notice that the first age which, from the dominant interests of its foremost minds, we have called scientific, lasted about 300 years, and that rather more than this period has elapsed since the beginning of the modern secularist age, if we date from the sixteenth century, rather less if we make the end of the Wars of Religion our starting point. Is there any sign of the law of rhythm reasserting itself? any indication that civilized humanity, unable to think along scientific and religious lines simultaneously, will elect to think primarily of religion? Candour compels us to reply that the signs, if they exist at all, are hard to find. But there is one factor which, so far as we can see, is bound to tell in favour of that return towards interest in non-measurable things which we believe is inevitable sooner or later. The world is growing very small. To say nothing of the charming old maps with their *hic sunt leones*, in the boyhood of men who are not yet old we had atlases with great empty spaces in Africa which our imagination could people with mysterious White Queens or ape-faced men. Those spaces are now exploited for rubber and other tropical products and their names are familiar on the Stock Exchange. We already hear voices from every part of the world, and shall soon be able to watch our fellow-men from thousands of miles away. In one direction at least human progress is reaching its term—the inevitable limits of the planet in which we live. The frontiers have been rolled back till they can go no further. In a sense they are closing in upon us now. For the average man the enlargement of material interests has been primarily geographical. To penetrate the secrets of Nature in starry space or in the infinitely small must be the task of the few. Natural Science in the true sense of the phrase is now immensely technical and beyond the powers of all but a few specialized brains. Where is to be the outlet for the restless curiosity of

man? I believe that many of us will live to see the energies hitherto turned towards material things, and especially in recent years towards speed of locomotion as an end in itself, devoted to the limitless unexplored field of the mind and spirit; that progress for its own sake, mere speed without thought of the destination to reach which the engine is being so feverishly stoked, will come to seem childish. I do not venture to predict which, if any, organized religion will benefit by the new direction of the rhythm. But that the religious interest will revive, I am certain, not only because of my own faith, but because I see that the other great scientific age of the world was succeeded by the supreme religious age.

INDEX OF NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES

Matthew.

	PAGE
i. 18	12
i. 19	59
ii. 8	36
iv. 1 ff.	41 ff.
iv. 15	88
v. 3 ff.	37, 44 ff.
v. 5	24
v. 32	39, 63
vi. 5	54
vii. 24 ff.	33
vii. 29	40
xi. 21	18
xi. 27	39
xii. 27	83
xiii. 55	31 f.
xiii. 58	84
xiv. 5	40
xv. 19	59
xvi. 18	33
xvii. 25	18
xix. 3	64
xix. 9	59
xx. 2	117
xxiii.	21, 51, 54
xxiii. 2	34
xxiii. 37	75
xxv. 10	88
xxviii. 15	106

Mark.

i. 11	39
i. 16 ff.	26
i. 31, 32	19
ii. 3 ff.	20, 23
ii. 18 ff.	23, 90
ii. 23 ff.	21
iii. 13 ff.	121
iv. 10 ff.	121 f.
v. 36	97
vi. 3	31 ff.
vi. 4	40
vi. 5	84
vi. 6 ff.	121
vi. 15	40
vi. 41	92
vii. 1 ff.	27
vii. 8	54
vii. 28, 30	36
vii. 31 ff.	77
viii. 12	84
viii. 22 ff.	77
viii. 28	40
viii. 29	39
viii. 33	123
ix. 4	34
ix. 24	36
ix. 36	36, 38
x. 2	65
x. 3	34
x. 13 ff.	36
x. 14	38
x. 21	101
x. 32	29
x. 35 ff.	169
xii. 17	110, 123
xiii. 11	143
xiii. 14	121
xiv. 15	98
xiv. 24	39, 98
xv. 25	88
xv. 42 ff.	104 f.
xvi. 8	126

Luke.

i. 3	19
i. 17-20	10
i. 24	72
i. 33-36	10
i. 35	71 ff.
i. 66	79
i. 67	12
ii. 7	99
ii. 27	36
ii. 29 ff.	147
iii. 1	67
iii. 22	10
iii. 23	10, 19, 32
iv. 17 ff.	46
iv. 23 ff.	84
vi. 12 ff.	69
vii. 11 ff.	76
vii. 47	101
ix. 38 ff.	85
ix. 50	37
xi. 1	128
xiii. 11	85
xiii. 34	75
xiv. 9 f.	98
xiv. 13	180
xvi. 18	65
xvii. 21	38
xxi. 20 ff.	67
xxii. 14 ff.	98
xxii. 43	63

John.

i. 15	99
i. 29 ff.	91
i. 40 ff.	88
ii. 1 ff.	86
ii. 20	19
iii. 14	146
iv. 6, 47	88
v. 18	146
v. 20	101
vi. 11	92
vi. 36	99
vi. 62	167
vii. 30	86
viii. 12	208
viii. 20	86
viii. 28	146
viii. 57	19
x. 25	99
xi. 3, 5, 36	101
xi. 40	99

John.

	PAGE
xii. 23, 27	86
xii. 32, 34	146
xiii. 1	86
xiii. 33	99
xiv. 1 ff.	96 ff.
xiv. 30 f.	97
xvi. 5	97
xvi. 7	99
xvii. 1	86
xvii. 2, 21	208
xix. 14	88

Acts.

ii. 33	146
ii. 36	127
ii. 42, 46	177 f.
iii. 22	40
iv. 18, 30	146
v. 15	74
v. 36	47
vi. 2	177 f.
vii. 38, 53	156
viii. 1 ff.	134 f.
ix. 1	134
ix. 31	135
xi. 20	132
xii. 20	112
xiv. 12	29, 138
xv. 29	59, 65
xv. 31	60
xvi. 4	60
xvi. 10	124
xvi. 16	14
xviii. 2	120, 130
xviii. 24	134
xix. 1 ff.	134
xix. 2	11
xx. 5, 8	124
xx. 7	178
xxi. 8	69, 124
xxi. 20	135
xxi. 38	47
xxiii. 11	142
xxiii. 35	141
xxiv. 23	142
xxvii. 9 ff.	120
xxviii. 9 f.	142

Romans.

i. 16	130
i. 29	61
ii. 9 f.	130
ii. 14	158
iii. 5	137
v. 20	154
vii. 1	130
viii. 20	137

1 Corinthians.

i. 12	129
i. 26	114 f.
iii. 22	129
v. 1	59, 61 f., 65
v. 9-11	61
vi. 9	61
vii. 25	120
vii. 31	145
viii.	60
x. 21	180
xi. 17 ff.	178
xi. 23	92, 170
xi. 28	145
xii. 31	139
xiii. 13	151 ff.
xiv. 7	154
xv. 3 ff.	102 f., 125 ff.
xv. 55	144 f.

2 Corinthians.

i. 8 ff.	142
x. 10	138
xi. 5	129
xi. 6	138
xi. 32	133
xii.	138
xii. 21	61

Galatians.

i. 16, 22	133 f.
ii. 4	135
iii. 15 ff.	153 ff.
iv. 13 ff.	137 ff.
v. 11	133 f.
v. 14	146
v. 19	61

Ephesians.

v. 5	61
v. 22 ff.	159

Philippians.

	PAGE
i. 1, 7, 14, 19, 26	143
i. 13	140
i. 15 ff.	130
ii. 6 ff.	143 ff.
iii. 15	142
iv. 5	142
iv. 8	159
iv. 22	140

Colossians.

i. 20	156
ii. 9, 16 ff.	156
iii. 5	61
iii. 18 ff.	158 f.
iv. 2 f.	139
iv. 10	124, 130
iv. 14	130

1 Thessalonians.

ii. 18	138

1 Timothy.

ii. 9	159
iii. 16	146
vi. 3	87

2 Timothy.

i. 10	61

Titus.

ii. 1 ff.	159
ii. 2	155

Hebrews.

iii-iv. 8	42
vii. 10	156
xi. 31	61
xiii. 4	88

James.

ii. 1 ff.	115
ii. 25	61

1 Peter.

ii. 13 ff.	159

Jude.	PAGE
ix. . .	34
Apocalypse.	
i. 13 . .	145
ii. 14 . .	60
v. 6 . .	117
ix. 21 . .	61
xii. . .	14
xii. 6 . .	98
xiii. 18 . .	88
xiv. 14 . .	145
xvii. 1, 5, 15, 16 . .	61
xx. 13 . .	144
xxi. 8 . .	61
xxii. 15 . .	61

GENERAL INDEX

(*Names of modern scholars are in small capitals*)

ABRAHAMS, I., 48, 52 f., 155
Accession Feast, 7
Æon, 4
Agape, 179 ff.
Alexandria, 4 f.
Apostolic Council and Decree, 59 ff., 125
ASTLEY, H. J. D., 14

BADCOCK, F. J., 34
BARNIKOL, E., 133 ff.
BARTLET, V., 66
Beatitudes, The, 41
BILLERBECK, P., 14, 21, 64, 94 f.
BISHOP, W. C., 165
BOUSSET, W., 39, 132, 161
BOX, G. H., 5, 13, 71
BREMOND, H., 160, 215
BRIGGS, C. A., 71
BULTMANN, R., 20 ff., 24, 206 f.
BURKITT, F. C., 66
BURNEY, C. F., 147

CAIRNS, D. S., 105
Carpenter, 31
CHARLES, R. H., 117
Christmas, 1 ff.
Chronology, 19, 24
Confession to Laymen, 185 ff.

DALMAN, G., 86 f.
Dedication, feast of, 5
DEISSMANN, A., 84
DIBELIUS, M., 23, 29, 56, 68, 145, 157
DUCHESNE, L., 1, 91 f., 165 f.

Economics, 108 ff.
Epiclesis, 165 f., 183 f., 201
Epiphany, 4 ff., 90 f.
Eucharist, The, 91 f., 161 ff.
Excepting Clause, The, 59 ff.

FASCHER, E., 22
Folklore, 24
Formgeschichtlich Method, The, 18 ff.
FOWLER, W. W., 8 f.

GAVIN, F., 61 ff.
Glossolalia, 125
GORE, C., 13
GRANT, F. C., 109 ff.
GUNKEL, H., 7

HARNACK, A. VON, 151
Haustafeln, 157 ff.
HEADLAM, A. C., 5
HERFORD, R. T., 48 ff.
Hillel, 54
HODGSON, L., 54
HOLL, K., 1, 2, 91, 187 ff.

James, St., 15
John the Baptist, 11
Joshua, 41 ff.

KAUTSKY, K., 112 ff.
Kenosis, 55
KITTEL, R., 1 ff., 91
KUNDSIN, K., 95, 133

LAKE, K., 102 ff.
LEISEGANG, H., 1, 11 ff., 72
LEVERTOFF, P. P., 148
LIDZBARSKI, M., 206 ff.
LIETZMANN, H., 182 ff.
LIGHTFOOT, J. B., 137
LOHMEYER, E., 141 ff.
LOISY, A., 19, 161, 175
Luke, St., 9 ff.
LURJE, M., 108 f.

MACMUNN, V., 132
MACNABB, V., 94
MCNEILE, A. H., 39

Man, The Heavenly, 39, 208
Mandaeans, 206 ff.
Marriage feast, 86 ff.
Martyrdom, 142 f., 169, 196 ff.
Marxianism, 113 ff.
Mary, the Virgin, 10 ff., 71 ff.
Meals in common, 56, 177 ff.
Medicine, Greek, 84 f., 214
MEYER, E., 14, 16, 19, 34, 118 ff., 141
Miracle stories, 22 f., 76 ff.
MONTEFIORE, C. G., 48, 51 f.
MOORE, G. F., 48, 52, 57 f.
MOZLEY, J. K., 71

NORDEN, E., 1 ff., 72, 77, 91, 119

OESTERLEY, W. O. E., 4, 180 ff.
Overshadowing, 71 ff.

PALLIS, S. A., 206, 211
Paul, St., 123 ff.
PETERSON, E., 206, 210
Pharisaism, 28, 48 ff.
Proto-Luke, 66 ff.

RAMSAY, W. M., 136
REITZENSTEIN, R., 4, 77, 80 ff., 151 f., 208
Resurrection, The, 102 ff., 125 ff.
RIDDLE, D. W., 54
ROBERTSON, A. T., 87
Roman Catholicism, 58
ROPES, J. H., 65

SAINTYVES, 94
SCHMIDT, K. L., 18 ff., 24
SCHÜTZ, R., 132
SELWYN, E. C., 46 f.
Simeon the New Theologian, 187 ff.
Son, The, 39 f., 128
Spirit, 11 f.
STREETER, B. H., 24, 66 ff.

TARN, W. W., 116 f., 213
TAWNEY, R. H., 215
TAYLOR, A. E., 12
TAYLOR, V., 1, 9 ff., 15, 66 ff.
TEETAERT, A., 203 ff.
Temptation, The, 42 f., 83 f.
"Thorn in the Flesh," 136 ff.
THORNTON, L. S., 53
TORREY, C. C., 73
Transfiguration, The, 34 ff., 127

Virgil's Eclogue, 8 f.
Virgin Birth, The, 1 ff., 71 ff.
VÖLKER, K., 177 ff.

WATKINS, O. D., 185 ff.
WEIDINGER, K., 157 ff.
WEINREICH, O., 77 ff.
WEISS, J., 145
WESTCOTT, B. F., 97
WETTER, G. P., 92, 161 ff.
WINDISCH, H., 91

A 30761

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER

BS2361 .C385
Clarke, William Kemp Lowther, b. 1879.
New Testament problems : essays, review

BS
2361
.C385

Clarke, William Kemp Lowther, b.1879.
New Testament problems : essays, reviews, interpretations / by W. K. Lowther Clarke. -- New York : Macmillan, 1929.
xii, 222 p. ; 23 cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Bible. N.T.--Criticism, interpretation, etc. I. Title

A30761